

5

Transubstantiation Defended;
And Prov'd from
S C R I P T U R E:
IN
A N S W E R
TO
THE FIRST PART
OF A
T R E A T I S E,
INTITLED,
A Discourse against Transubstantiation.

The First Part.

S. Ignatius Ep. ad Smyrnaeos.

Ἐυχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς αὐτέχονται διὰ τὸ μὴ ὄμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα
εἶναι τὴν Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χειρα τὴν μὲν αἱματικὴν ἡμῶν παθεῖσαν, ἵνα τὴν χειρό-
την ὁ πατὴρ ἡγετεύειν: Οἱ δὲ αὐτοὶ λέγοντες τὴν σάρκα τὴν θεὸν συζητοῦντες αὐτοῖς οὐκέτε.

They abstain from our Communion, because they do not confess the Eucharist to be the Flesh of our
Saviour Jesus Christ, that very Flesh which suffer'd for our sin, which the Father of his bounty raised again:
Those therefore which contradict this free gift of God, die scrupulously Questioning the matter
amongst themselves.

Published with Allowance.

LONGDON,

Printed by *Henry Hills*, Printer to the King's Most Excellent
Majesty for His Household and Chappel. 1687.

Case

C

8231

.8775

The Principal Contents of the Introduction.

1. Reasons why the Discourse against Transubstantiation lay so long unanswered.
2. The Real or Essential Presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament, shew'd to be the Doctrine of the English Church.
3. How the Catholic Church necessarily inferreth Transubstantiation from our Saviour's words understood in a proper Sense.
4. The Pretended Demonstration to the contrary from the Sense of the Word *This*, in those Words of our Lord, *This is my Body*, so highly boasted of in the *Expostulatory Letter to Mr. Sclater of Putney*, shew'd to be a mere Illusion.

A N INTRODUCTION To the ensuing ANSWER.

Some have wondred, whilst others Triumph't, and a late Writer particularly hath vainly boasted, in a certain * Letter to a Friend, that ^{* Publisht at Dublin.} Two great Doctors of the English Church, had baffled their Adversaries of Rome even to the silencing of that Party, and all this was because the Discourse against Transubstantiation lay so long unanswered. The best account, that I can give of the so long silence, is, that the more considerate knew, that the said Discourse contained no new matter, but only what had been very often objected against us since the Pretended Reformation of the English Church, and as often fully Answered, as also, that there have been (a) two large Volums Writen by a Learned Catholic Author, and (b) cited by the Discourser himself, wherein the Objections against Transubstantiation are put much further than this late Discourse urges them, and all clear'd beyond the Power of any solid Answer; and we find none for many Years last

^(a) Mr. Arniuds
two last Volums concer-
ning the Per-
petuity of the
Faith, &c.

^(b) Pa. 42. Of
the Discourse
against Tran-
substantiation.

An Introduction.

past so much as offer'd at against the said Treatises, nor yet to a more compendious one Entitl'd, A Rational Discourse concerning Transubstantiation Publish't 1676. In which the chief Objections repeated since by the Discourser are fully clear'd. Moreover, the Doctrin of the English Church concerning the Real Presence being no less vigorously attack'd by the late Discourser, than that of the Roman Catholic, it was thought more proper, that some of them should have first return'd an Answer to it, because they had the greater Reason to resent the injury done them, since a wound from a pretended Friend is more grievous than from a profest Adversary.

Indeed, I would not have the Genuin Sons of the English Church to think, that we differ so much with them in this Point, as some by Misrepresenting the thing, would make us to do, seeing that they do acknow-

Resp. ad Apol. Bell. c. 7. p. 11. ledge with Bishop Andrews, præsentiam non minus quam nos veram; no less True Presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament, than we do, and I am

sure that is True enough; our difference with them, (who deny Consubstantiation, as is manifest from their Writings,) being only about the not admitting the Word Transubstantiation, whereas they have so long freely acknowledged the thing. For if the Body of Christ be Really present in the Sacrament, and not with the substance of Bread, it must be there without it, under the External Species only of Bread, and consequently such a change of substance as the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation, must certainly be made; and there can be no other Sense given of that Real Presence which hath been received in their Church.

Now

An Introduction.

Now, that the Real Presence of Christ's Body, together with it's Vertue and Efficacy, is the acknowledged Belief of the Greatest and most Learned Persons of the English Communion is * certain, notwithstanding the weak endeavor of an imperfect Answerer to the Animadversions upon the Alterations of their Rubrick lately Publisht, to shew the contrary. Which that it may the more plainly appear, I shall add one Observation made by a Famed Doctor of their Church, which will be the more Authentick, because it was drawn from their Records.

It was proposed, saith this * Doctor, to have the Communion Book, viz. That put forth in the beginning of Queen Elizabeths Reign, so contriv'd, that it might not exclude the Belief of the Corporal Presence: (I doubt not, but they meant after a Spiritual manner, as Catholics do suitably to St. Paul who uses the words Spiritual Body to signifie a Real Body existing after a Spiritual manner) For the chief Design of the Queens Council was to unite the Nation in one Faith, and the Greater part of the Nation continued to believe such a Presence; (which however seems to have been determin'd against in their former Articles and Rubrick.) Thereupon, the Rubrick that explain'd the reason for kneeling at the Sacrament, that thereby no Adoration is intended to any Corporal Presence of Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood, because that is only in Heaven, which had been in King Edwards Liturgy, is left out — * And in the Article about the Lords Supper the Refutation of the Corporal Presence was by Common consent left out. — And in the next Convocation the Articles were subscribed with-

* vid. Two Discourses concerning the Adoration of our Blessed Saviour in the Eucharist, &c. c. 2. of the first Discourse. Printed at Oxford, An 1657.

* Dr. Barnet in his History of the Reformation Part 2. p. 390. Of the Reign of Qu. Elizabeth. See also Dr. Heylins Cyprianus Anglicus, p. 22. in the Introduction.

* Part 2. of Hist. Reform. p. 425.

An Introduction.

without them, of which, he tells us, he had seen the Original. Now, whatsoever this Doctor (whose usual Practice it hath been, like the Snake in the Fable, to bite and betray those that have cherisht him) pretends to know of a Secret concerning this matter, (for which he doth not bring the least proof or Authority, whereas he had seen the Original to be an evidence of what he had before said,) yet for my part I have more Deference for the English Chirrch, than to believe that the Real Presence of Christs Body in the Sacrament was, after so much consideration about the matter, (now behold the secret comes out,) left as a speculative Opinion, as he saith, and not determin'd, but every Man left to the freedom of his own mind, because an express Definition against the Real Presence might drive from the Church many who were still of that perswasion. For then those studiously alter'd Articles and Rubrick had only been made as a Trap to draw Men into Idolatry, and keep them in it, if you will believe some of the great Modern Writers who live in Communion, at present, with the English Church, and yet deny that Real Presence, which was both in Queen Elizabeths time, and ever since believed in that Church, and tax those with Idolatry who Worship Christ thus present. Therefore we have good Reason to allow, what he tells us afterwards, that some (we are sure that many of the most Learned amongst them) have since truly inferr'd, that the Chief Pastors of the Church did then disapprove of the Definition made in King Edward's time, and that they were for a Real Presence.

And of this we can make no doubt, when we peruse the Writings of those Pastors, who succeeding them till this

An Introduction.

this very time, have given so full an account of their Faith in this weighty instance, and yet have past uncensur'd, nay, have been of greatest esteem in their Church. And how indeed can we imagin, that Men of the least sincerity would leave an Article of infinite concern to Mens Immortal Souls in so undeterminat a Sense, that Christians might believe, which they pleas'd, either that Christ's Body was thus Really present in the Sacrament, which, if it were not, they incur'd the guilt of gross Idolatry, or that it was not so, which if Really it was, they were guilty of Infidelity, in not believing Our Lord upon his Word; and a breach of the first Commandment, in not Worshipping the second Person in the Trinity, presenting himself to us in this Sacrament; according to that saying, of the Great

* St. Augustin concerning this matter; Peccamus * In Psal. 98.

non adorando, We sin in not Worshipping? Such an Equivocation as this, in an Assembly of Christian Pastors, upon the proposal of so great a Point, must needs have been of far more dangerous consequence to Christians, than the Ambiguous Answers of the Delphic Oracle, were to the Heathen World. Thus far then the business is clear'd, that the Real, and not Virtual Presence only of Christ's Body in the Sacrament, was the Doctrine of the English Church; for what some Men amongst them of great Latitude in Belief have maintain'd to the contrary, doth not prejudice the truth, which the more sound of that Communion have generally asserted.

And notwithstanding, that their Late Clergy in the Year, 1661. in compliance to the Dissenting Party, by the chief management of the late Lord Shaftesbury's Politic Spirit, were induced after hard soliciting

An Introduction.

to receive an Additional Declaration, (tho' not Printed in their Rubrick Letter,) at the end of their Communion Service, yet, since they would not by any means be brought to receive the former Declaration of King Edward the Sixth's time, without the change of those words [It is here declared that no Adoration is here intended or ought to be done unto any Real and Essential Presence of Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood] into these which follow [It is here declared, that no Adoration is here intended or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine there Bodily Received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's Natural Flesh and Blood] the words Real and Essential, as you see, being changed into, Corporal; this cannot but reasonably be imagin'd to be done out of Caution to the Present Church, her maintaining still a Real and Essential Presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament; whereas those in the latter time of King Edward seem to have denied it. Moreover, tho' it be said in this last Declaration, that the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very Natural Substances, and therefore may not be Adored, yet if by Natural Substances or Essences here is no more meant, (as the words may very well be understood, and are shewn by Catholics to be understood in the Authorities of Theodoret, and Gelasius,) than the external and sensible Essences, or properties of Bread and Wine, and not the internal Substance, or Essence, this Declaration will not be repugnant, either to the Real Presence or to Transubstantiation, and the Adoration will be terminated neither on the Internal or External Essences of Bread and Wine, but upon Christ the only begotten Son of God, Really Present

An Introduction.

sent in the Blessed Sacrament, which the * Council * Can. 6. de 1
of Trent it self hath declared to be the Sense of the Eucbaristia in
Catholic Church as to the Point of Adoration. Santo Eucbar-

Hie Sacramento
Christum uni-
genium Dei
filium cultu La-
triae adorandum.

Again, if the last part of this Declaration, where-
in it is said, that the Natural Body and Blood of Christ are in Heaven and not here; it being a-
gainst the Truth of Christ's Natural Body to be at
one time in more places than one, be yet urg'd,
to prove, that the above mention'd Real Presence
of Christ's Body in the Eucharist is not at present the
Doctrine of the English Church. I answer, that where-
as it is there said, that the Natural Body and Blood
of Christ are in Heaven, and not here, meaning
in the Sacrament; if by Natural Body be there un-
derstood Christ's Body, according to the Natural man-
ner of a Bodies being present, and according to which,
tho' in a glorified state, it actually exists in Heaven,
we do not say, that the Body of Christ is here in this
Sacrament in that natural manner, any more than the
Doctors of the English Communion; but if no more
be meant by the words, Natural Body, but the very
true and (as we may call it) Essential Body of Christ,
tho' present in a supernatural manner, proper to the
Sacrament, it is a very bold assertion to say absolutely,
that it is against the Truth of it to be so, or that this
cannot possibly be true, since we know so little to what
the Omnipotence of God, which could convey this very
Body into the Room, where the Disciples were, the
Doors being fast shut, can extend it self, and yet the Body
be the very same Body in verity of Nature which is
in Heaven; the Presence of which in the Sacrament
a late Eminent * Author of the English Church (a) suf-
ficiently intimates, that some (he might have said
, In a Tre-
tise intitled
several Con-
ferences. Sc.
(a) Pag. 65.

An Introduction.

very many) of their Divines have maintain'd; notwithstanding the vain endeavors, which the Answerer to the Treatise, Printed at Oxford, to shew the sentiment of the Church of England Divines in this Point, has us'd to wrest them to another Sense: For after having told us his own Opinion, viz. that all which the Doctrin of his Church (meaning the Church of England) implies, is only a Real Presence of Christ's Invisible Power and Grace, so in and with the Elements, as by the Faithful receiving of them, to convey Spiritual and Real Effects to the Souls of Men, he subjoyns, if any one yet thinks, that some at least of our Divines have gone farther than this, i. e. do seem to speak of the Presence of the very same Body which is in Heaven, let them know,

* See their 28 Art. of Religi-
o. 1 which con-
firms the Body of Christ to be
and eaten in the Supper after an
Heavenly and Spiritual man-
ner, and Ca-
tec. where it is said, the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and in
deed taken and received. The forecited Au-
thor doth not well defend
this Doctrin.

says he, it is the * Doctrin of our Church I am to de-
fend, and not of every particular Divine in it. Now altho' by those wary terms, of every particular Di-
vine, and seeming to speak, he endeavors what he
can both to diminish the number, and their clear acknow-
ledgment of the Presence of the same Body in the Sa-
crament which is in Heaven, yet he could not but
know that the Asserters of it were very many, and
still are, even since the Declaration, and such as may
be presumed to know the meaning of it, as cunningly
worded as it is, as well, if not better than himself; and
for this, besides what I have had by particular converse
with divers, I will appeal to the sincerity of those who
have heard the Determinations which have been made
by their Learned Professors in the Publick Schools of
both their Universities, ever since this last Declara-
tion was receiv'd, whether they are not fully satisfied,
that they have been much more Positive for a Real Pre-
sence

An Introduction.

sence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament, in a further Sense than the abovementioned Author, and others in their Late Discourses against Transubstantiation declare themselves to be. And I have the rather given the Sense before expressed of the last clause of their new Declaration, which indeed is the only one it can truly bear, because the Catholic Church Authoriseth it in the * Council of Trent, by Declaring there, that these two things are not inconsistent, viz. that Our Saviour according to his Natural way of Existing, should sit at the Right hand of his Father in Heaven, and that he should be in the substance Present to us Sacramentally, by that manner of Existence; which altho' it can scarcely be expressed in words, yet our mind enlightened by Faith can be brought to conceive, that it is possible with God.

Stendi ratione; quam etsi verbis exprimere vix possumus, possibilem tamen esse Deo cognitione per fidem illustrata affequi possumus.

I hope therefore, that Christian Charity may in time put a happy end to the tedious Disputes, which have been so long held about the Blessed Sacrament; that so the Sacred Symbol's of Peace and Unity may no longer be made the Subject of Contention. Especially when we consider, that tho', when the * strange Opinion, of there being only some certain Virtue of Christ's Body in the Sacrament, and not that very Body it

nunc dicere, non in re esse veritatem carnis Christi, vel Sanguinis; sed in Sacramento virtutem quandam carnis & non carnem. — concerning which Real Presence it is said: Usque ad præsens nemo deerrasse legitur, nisi qui de Christo erraverunt, and futher — Quamvis ex hoc quidam de ignorantia errant, nemo tamen est adhuc in aperto, qui hoc ita esse contradicat, quod totus orbis credit & constitetur.

** Sess. 13.
c. 1. Neque enim hæc inter se pugnant, juxia modum existendi naturalis Salvato-*

rem nostrum in cæli assidere ad dextram Patris & nobis substantiam suam adesse præsentem Sacramentaliter, eâ exi-

** Paschalias Epist. ad Fru-
degard —
Miror quid vo-
lunt quidem*

An Introduction.

self was first privately held, about eight hundred and eighteen Years after our Saviours time, by some Persons that erred through ignorance, yet they were sham'd publickly to contradict, as some in this last Age have done, that Real Presence which the whole Christian World believ'd and confess, and concerning which none had ever before erred in the Church, but those who had erred concerning Christ himself. Likewise, that altho' the fourth Great Council of Lateran, one of the Greatest which ever was held in the Christian World, that they might put an end to the contentions then arisen, and maintain Christian verity, and peace amongst the Faithful, did in declaring the Faith of the Church concerning the Blessed Sacrament make use of the word

* De Christo loquens Concilium, cuius corpus & sanguis in Sacramento altaris, sub speciebus panis & vini veraciter coniunctur, Transubstantiatis pane in corpus, & vino in sanguinem, potestate Divinâ. Concil. Lateranense 4.

* Transubstantiated, to express precisely that Great and Supernatural change therein made, which the Catholic Church had in all precedent Ages even from Christ's time believed, as being necessarily deduced from our Saviours words, and express by the Primitive Fathers in several other terms signifying the same thing; yet the Catholic Church thought it not necessary to determin any thing concerning those nicer speculations about the modes of this wonderful change, which have exercised the more subtle Wits, even before the time of the Lateran Council and ever since.

Generale, Anno

Christi 1215. vid. in Binnio. c. I. p. 806.

And of this excellent moderation used by the Catholic Church we have a clear evidence from the proceedings of the Council of Trent in reference to this matter

An Introduction.

matter which, as * Padre Paul himself, notwithstanding he was no great friend to Catholics in his *Historical Relations of the Proceedings of this Council*, relates, determin'd to use so very few, and those Universal terms in the Article of the Blessed Sacrament, as might satisfie both Parties, viz. the *Scotists and Thomists*, and be fitly accommodated to the Sense of each of them; but not so as to establish their distinct private speculations. (a) Cardinal Pallavicino likewise tells us, speaking concerning the circumspection of the Tridentin Fathers, that they would have nothing determin'd concerning the *modus* or manner of the Sacramental Presence of Christ. So far were they from prejudicing either of the Theological Classes, or from offering to declare those things as Articles of Faith which were not the Revelations of God, but the speculations of Men. So that, if we can agree, that this great supernatural change is made in the Sacrament, without the admission of which those of the English Church can never prove, that Presence of Christ's Body in the Holy Eucharist, which they acknowledge to be (b) no less true than we do, they will be yet left at liberty, and need not determin rashly concerning the manner of it, nor so much as anxiously to inquire into this Point.

For indeed Transubstantiation is a great mystery of Christian Religion, so is the Doctrine of the Trinity, so is the Incarnation of our Lord, to which the Primitive Fathers do so often compare the su-

cce. E perciò niente si volle determinare, intorno al modo della presenza sacramentale di Cristo. (b) *Presentiam credimus nec minus quam vos veram, de modo presentiae nihil temere definimus; addo, nec anxie inquiramus.* Bishop Andrews, *Resp. ad Apoll. Bell.* C. 1. P. II.

per natural

* *Historia Concil. Trident.*

Francosurti Edit. 1521.

lib. 4. pa. 367.

In Congregati- one mox Gene-

rali statuum, in dogmata confi-

ciento verbi uti quam pau-

cissimis, ilisque adeo universali-

bus, ut utrisque, viz. Scoti.

& Thomæ Seclatoribus,

queant satisfac-

cere, & ad uiri-

usque partis

sensum com-

modè aptari.

(a) *In parte se-* condia del Isto-

ria del Concilio di Trento l. 12.

cap. primo.

Speaking of

the Definitions of the

Council, hath

these words:

Le quali tue sono così circus-

pette che talora paiono in cercar

forme di parole lontane da ogni

sembianza di pregiudicio &

veruna delle Classi Teologi-

An Introduction.

pernatural change made in the Sacrament; so is the Resurrection of our Bodies; yet these Articles of Christian Faith are to be believed upon the Authority of the Revealer, and not too curiously to be pried into.

I shall insist only upon the Resurrection at present, to shew how little ground they have to believe this, upon the account of natural Reason, who reject the belief of Transubstantiation, by Virtue of which we receive the Instrument and pledge of our Resurrection Christs Real Body in the Sacrament: Both these indeed may seem contrary to Reason, before enlightened by Faith: For how can that convince us, that the same Body which dies shall rise again; since some that eat Mans Flesh in the extremity of Famin, or, as the Cannibals, out of luxury, have the substance of the Bodies, that they eat, converted into the substance of their own Bodies by the way of nourishment: And several other ways there be, by which the reduced parts of our Dead Bodies are changed into the substance of other Human Bodies, even so, that the same Bodies may be claimed by many at the Resurrection? Notwithstanding we believe, that we shall rise with the same Bodies we had, whilst living. Dim sighted Reason will ask, how this can be, since it is against the Nature of a Body to be in two places at the same time? Yet Nature and experience prepare us for the belief of the Resurrection, which seems to be against Nature, by the example of those things, which are obvious to Sense. Seed, as the Apostle instanceth, is cast into the ground, it corrupts, ^{1 Cor. 15. 38.} and yet riseth again, for God giveth it a Body, and to every Seed it's own Body. So to dispose us to the belief of the supernatural change made in the Sacrament, nothing is more familiar than Natural Transubstantiation,

An Introduction.

substantiation, for our life is sustained by a dayly change of the substance of other Creatures into that of our Bodies ; we should soon die without this : Nay we cannot breath, but the substance of our Bodies is converted into Air ; and he that denies this Transubstantiation, confutes himself while he speaks. Thus Bread also was dayly Transubstantiated into our Lords Body, whilst he fed upon it here on Earth. All which may dispose us to believe, that the Bread in the Sacramental Consecration, as * Gregory Nyssen teacheth us, passeth into the Body of Christ the Word, not indeed as it did by the way of manducation, and nourishment, but being suddainly transform'd into the Body of the Word, as is said by the Word, This is my Body.

And if our curious Inquirers shall further ask ; how this can be, since the accidents or outward species of Bread still remain ? I desire them to resolve these Questions : How a thousand species can be reflected from the same Glass at once, to a thousand Eyes at the same time ? How the same Glass being whole, transmits one intire species, and yet broken into many small pieces, every piece reflects the same whole and intire species, there being all the while but one subject, and what that subject is wherein these species do subsist ? Or let them but give a true account of the nature of any small Particle of that matter, which composeth the Universe, before they pry too far into the secrets of Divine and supernatural Mysterie, and think that God can do nothing, but in such a manner as they can comprehend.

* Ut enim illuc verbi Dei gratia sanctum efficit illud corpus cuius firmamen. Ium ex pane constabat. Et ipsum etiam quodammodo panis erat, sic etiam bic panis, ut ait Apostolus, per verbum Dei orationem Sanctificatur, non quia conceditur eo progressus ut verbi corpus evadat, sed statim per verbum incorpus mutatur, (τοῦτο σῶμα τὸ λόγος μεταστρέψεται) ut dictum est à verbo, hoc

est corpus meum. Casechet. Orat. c. 37.

Therefore

An Introduction.

Therefore our Adversaries had good reason to say, speaking concerning the Objections against the Trinity, Incarnation and the Resurrection with identity of

(a) Dr. Taylor of the Real Presence. pa. 237.

Bodies, (a) That if there were as plain Revelation of Transubstantiation, as of those, then this Argument were good ; and that if it were possible to bring a thousand more Arguments against Transubstantiation, yet that we are to believe the Revelation in despite of them all : *Again, That*

(b) *Idem* Liberty of Prophecy. §. 20. n. 16.

(b) Those who believe the Trinity in all those Niceties of Explications which are in the Schools, and which now a days pass for the Doctrin of the Church, believe them with as much violence to the principles of natural and supernatural Philosophy, as can be imagin'd to be in the Point of Transubstantiation. *And do not therefore insist upon the Point*

(c) Dr. Stillingfleet Rat. account, p. 117. and 565.

(c) how far Reason is to be submitted to Divine Authority, in case of certainty, that there is a Divine Revelation for what they are to believe.

(d) Bishop Forbes p. 395. *Vid. etiam confessionem Theologorum, Wittenberg. in Confess. A. 1552.*

(d) that there are things, *hanc pana*, not few in number, which we all believe, that, if human Reason be consulted, do not seem less impossible, and less manifestly contradictory than Transubstantiation it self.

Now, that the words of our Lord, This is my Body, being understood in a proper Sense, as in the ensuing Answer is prov'd they ought to be, do necessarily infer Transubstantiation, is manifest. Because, as is allowed by all, that was Bread which our Lord took into his hands, before he spoke those Words ; there must therefore a Change be made, otherwise it could not Really become Christ's Body, nor that which he gave his Disciples, be in a proper Sense so called.

And

An Introduction.

And the Accidents or sensible species still remaining as before, the change must be made in the substance.

*This is what the * Tridentine Council infers in these Words: Because Christ our Redeemer did affirm, that truly to be his Body which he offer'd, under the species of Bread, therefore, it was ever believed in the Church of God, which also the Holy Synod now again Declares, that by the Consecration of the Bread and Wine, there is a Conversion made of the whole substance of Bread into the substance of the Body of our Lord Christ, and of the whole substance of the Wine into the substance of his Blood, which Conversion is, by the Holy Catholic Church fitly and properly called Transubstantiation.*

sionem fieri totius substantie panis in substantiam corporis Christi Domini nostri, & totius substantie vini in substantiam sanguinis ejus, que Conversio convenienter & propriè à Sancta Catholica Ecclesia Transubstantiatio est appellata.

The foregoing Inference will evidently appear to be true, if we consider the proper and genuine Sense of every particular Word in that Proposition of our Lord, This is my Body.

*This, here in its true and * proper Sense, signifies some Thing, Essence, Substance, or Object in general, under such an appearance as was Demonstrated to Sense. For if by the word, This, were express the whole Nature of the Predicate in such a Proposition, e. g. as This is Bread, or This is my Body, then the Proposition would be purely Identical, or Tautological; for it would be no more than if one should say, This Bread is Bread, or This my Body is my Body: Whereas it is the property of the Attribute to extend, and fully to determin the Idea of the Subject, by ad-*

*sess. 13. de Eucbar. c. 4.
Quoniam au-
tem Christus
Redemptor no-
ster, corpus
suum id, quod
sub specie panis
offerebat verè
esse dixit, ideo
persuasum sem-
per in Ecclesia
Dei fuit, idque
nunc sancta bac-
Synodus decla-
rat, per Conse-
crationem Panis
& Vini conver-*

An Introduction.

ding clearness to it. And we must remember, that the English word, This, is express by τό in the Original Greek here, as also in most other Languages, not by ἄρτος in the Maschline Gender, so as to agree with ἄρτος Bread. Now tho' there be no distinction as to the Gender in the English word, This, Yet τό, ἄρτος, This. Bread, as our Adversaries would have here meant, is false Grammar.

In like manner the Word, Is, hath here it's proper Sense; not as it is used sometimes, for Signifies. The Word My can have Relation to no other Person but our Lord, who spoke it; nor consequently to any other Body, but his own, truly so, as to it's Substance, and therefore truly express by the Word, Body; that, which was before Bread, at the beginning of the Enunciation, This is my Body, being now made to be his Body at its Conclusion, because in Practical Propositions as this is, with God to say, and to do, are the same thing; and thus you see, what is meant by each word in the Proposition, This is my Body, as explicated by Catholics, tho' you do not believe the Mystery.

* See Veteres Vindicati, in an Expostulatory Letter to Mr. Sclater of Tunney, pa. 57.

Let us now observe, what a Late * Expostulator hath said against this Explication. He undertakes to prove, that the Words, This is my Body, cannot be taken in a literal, (I conceive he means proper, in opposition to Figurative) Sense, which he supposes his Enemies themselves of our Party will grant, if he proves that the, This, here mentioned is Bread; which he thus undertakes to do.

That, saith he, which our Saviour took into his Hands, (when he was about the Institution) was

An Introduction.

was Bread; that which he blessed was the same thing that he had taken into his hands; that which he brake was the same thing that he had blessed; that which he gave them when he said it was his Body, was that which he had broken; But that which he broke, which he blessed, which he took into his hands was Bread: Therefore it was Bread, which he gave his Disciples, and by ~~This~~, is meant This Bread.

This * Induction, *saith the Expostulator*, is so fair * Observe and so clear, that I am sure you cannot evade it.

But what, Sir, if after all your mighty boasting, This prove to be neither a fair Induction, nor any Argument at all, but a mere Fallacy or Illusion proceeding from what Logicians call, Ignoratio Elenchi, Ignorance of Argument or proof? And just such a one as This would be, if proposed to you: That which the Butcher expos'd to Sale was raw Flesh; that which you bought was the same thing, that the Butcher expos'd to Sale; that which you Eat was the same thing that you bought; But that which you bought, which the Butcher expos'd to Sale was raw Flesh, therefore you Eat raw Flesh. The Kitchin-Boy will tell you where the Fallacy lies, and help you out at a dead lift.

But to make the matter yet more plain, I shall give you some other instances in your way of Sophistry, which the most ignorant at the first hearing will discover to be Fallacies. That which the Servants at the Marriage of Cana in Galilee, took from the Fountain, was Water; that which they poured into the Water-pots was the same, that they took from the Fountain; that which the Guests drank was the same, that the Servants put into the Water-pots; But that which

that this is no Induction but rather a Sorites, altho' the Author knew not how to put the Subject and Prediccate in their right places. See any Common Logic.

An Introduction.

the Servants took from the Fountain, which they pou-
red into the Pots was Water ; therefore it was Water
which the Guests drank. Or your Argument may in
a shorter way be turn'd against you thus : That which
Christ took into his hands, he gave : But, that which he
took into his hands was not Sacramental Bread, nor
virtually Christ's Body, therefore that which he gave was
not Sacramental Bread, nor virtually Christ's Body.

And now repeating your Argument truly, tho' with-
out all your heap of words, I shall expose it's Fallacy
plainly. That, you say, which Christ took, &c. he
gave ; but he took Bread ; therefore he gave Bread. I
distinguish the Major. That he took, he gave ; un-
changed or in the same manner he took it, I deny :
What he took, he gave, changed and made his Body I
grant, and so agreeing he took Bread, I deny your Con-
sequence. Look into your Logic again, observe it well,
and you will find, that to make a Proposition contra-
dictory to ours, viz. That, that which Christ gave
was his Real Body, you must observe the Rules of
your Master Aristotle, so as to speak, de eodem mo-
do, & eodem tempore, which you have not here
known how to do. Yet you for all this, would be esteemed
the Great Champion for the Protestant cause, and
boast, that this your matter and Argument is so
Demonstrative, that you cannot but stand amazed
that Men, who pretend to reason, can refuse it.

This pretended Demonstration might be much more
exposed, had I leisure, whilst I am discoursing upon so
serious a point, to insist upon trifles. Neither would
the * Remarks, which he afterwards makes, help him
in the least ; For tho' our Saviour did say, accord-
ing to St. Luke and St. Paul, This Cup is the
New

* See Expo-
stulatory Let-
ter, pa. 58.

An Introduction.

New Testament in my Blood, yet this passage doth not fully determin, *that*, by This is my Body is meant This Bread is my Body : For the word, This, in the Proposition, This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood ; being joyned with the word Cup, by a known Figure, to signifie in a General way, what is contained in the Cup, only makes the Proposition to Signifie, That, which is contained in the Cup is the New Testament in my Blood ; which in the Evangelists St. Matthew and St. Mark, is expr. st by these words, This is my Blood of the New Testament; so that the word This still, alth³ joyned to Cup, hath no other kind of signification than it hath in the Words, This is my Body, as I have before explained them : Also if it had the Sense which the Author of the Expostulatory Letter would give it, then the meaning would be, This Wine is the New Testament in my Blood, or as according to St. Matthew and St. Mark, This Wine is my Blood of the New Testament, which words in the Sense that our Adversaries put upon them, would in those circumstances, wherein they were spoken, have been contrary to the Rules of Human Discourse, suitably to what is shew'd in the ensuing * Answer concerning the Words, This is my Body, taken in their Sense.

The Adversary indeed, in This Expostulatory Letter, insolently Triumphs, because he hath found out some mistakes in Translating, &c. But his Answer to the Fathers Authorities which have been so often truly cited as an undeniable Evidence against his Party, will easily be shew'd to be unsatisfactory, (when we come to their proper place) and be so slightly attacks, as you have seen, our main Evidence the

* Pag. 33. &c.

An Introduction.

* *Ipse panis & the * proper Sense of our Lords words as hardly to
vinum trans- bring the face of an Argument against it: So we Read
mutantur in corpus & San- that a Humorsom (a) Emperor, when he came to invade
corum Dei. Great Britain, only gather'd Cockles, and yet for this
Nec quicquam nobis amplius perspectum & thinking his Shell-spoils worthy Offerings for the
exploratum est Capitول.*

*quam quod ver-
bum Dei verum
est & efficax, atque omnipotens. S. Johan. Damascen. lib. 3. Orthodox. fidei. c. 14.*

(a) *Caligula.*

*We have one Request now to make to those who oppose the Doctrin of Transubstantiation, That because it is necessary for an Answerer to know distinctly what the Persons mean to whom he is to make an Answer, they would deal sincerely with us; and since we have told them in what Sense every word in the Proposition This is my Body is taken by us, and how the Catholic Church doth necessarily infer Transubstantiation from them, they would now deal as candidly with us, and tell us, as plainly, as we have done, how they understand each of these words. I have reason to intreat this favor of them, because altho' they seem sometimes to maintain only a Virtual not Real Presence of Christs Body in the Sacrament, which Opinion of theirs I have chiefly opposed in the Ensuing Answer; yet at other-times they * (and even the Discourser himself) readily acknowledge a Great Supernatural change to be made by the Divine Benediction, and the Author of the * Expostulatory Letter hath a Reserv'd Distinction, of Christs Natural and Spiritual Flesh and Blood, seeming to allow that Christ hath a Spiritual Body in the Sacrament: We know not but that he intends the same, which the Learned Author of a Brief*

* See p. 11.
In the Dis-
course against
Transubstan-
tiation, Edi-
Londini, 1684.

* Pag. 102.

An Introduction.

Brief Discourse of the Real Presence *hath lately given us of* A Brief Dis-
two *Bodies of Christ*, the one Natural in which he was Cru-
cified, the other Spiritual belonging to him, as he is the
Eternal Logos, in whom is the *Zew*, Life or Spirit, which and Licenc'd
goes along with the Divine Body of this Life or Spirit of by *Guil. Need.*
Christ, and consequently is rightly call'd his Body. For *ham Archiep.*
this, he grounds himself upon that earnest lofty and sublime *Cant. à Sac.*
Domest.

Discourse (*as he calls it*) of our Saviour in the 6th. Chapter
of St. John, confessing ingenuously, that it seems to him
incredible, that under so lofty, mysterious a style, and
earnest asseverations of what he affirms, tho' to the scan-
dal both of the Jews, and his own Disciples, there
should not be couched some most weighty and profound
Truth concerning some Real Flesh and Blood of his, touch-
ing which this vehement and sublime Discourse is framed.

pa. 40. *And than again, pa. 42. and 43.* It is plain, *says he*, that our Saviours Discourse in that Chapter, has for
its Object or Subject, not the manner or way of receiving
his Body and Blood, as if meant of that very Body and
Blood on the Cross, to be receiv'd in a Spiritual manner,
which Interpreters several of them (*meaning of the Refor-*
mers) drive at, and which he thinks would be a very dilute
and frigid Sense of such high and fervid asseverations of our
Saviour; but the Object of his Discourse, *says he*, is his
very Flesh and Blood it self, to be taken (as the Fish and
Loaves were wherewith he lately fed them;) or it is him-
self in reference to his Flesh and Blood, which belongs to
him as he is the Eternal Logos. *Thus evidently did our Sa-*
viour seem to this Learned Man, to speak all along to the
very end of his Discourse, of a Really Eating his Flesh and
Drinking his Blood; and not of the manner of Eating, as
if it never came nigh them, but only they thought of Flesh
and Blood, God knows how far distant from them, and so
Eat the human Flesh of Christ by meer thinking of it, and
Drank his Blood after the same imaginary manner. *Thus*
to avoid the Catholic Tenent of Transubstantiation (which he
could bear no more than the Jews) and yet verifie the Words
of Christ's Bodies being receiv'd verily and indeed, and such
other Expressions found in the Catechism and Homilies of the

Church

An Introduction.

Church of England (which he thought himself bound to maintain) he was driven to distinguish a double Body of Christ, the one Human and Natural, the other Spiritual and Divine, but both Real, as has been said before. Good God, what Chimera's will not a mind preoccupied with Error, frame to it self rather than submit to the Truth !

Luther indeed tells us of about ten Opinions of the Sacramentarians in his time; and a Book was Publisht in the Year, 1527, in which were reckon'd no less than 200 several Expositions of the Sense of these words; *Hoc est Corpus meum*; *This is my Body*. What we would gladly know of our Adversaries with whom we have now to deal, is, which of these (now two hundred and one) Opinions, it is that they maintain, or whether they have any other yet in Store (for Error hath no End) different from all these. For surely after all, they must be forc'd to allow, that there is but one True Sense of our Saviours Words, viz. either that it is his very true Substantial Body, which is taken and received, or a figure only, what vertue soever they please to assign to it. If the former, they fall in with the Catholics, or * Dr. Moors Tenet; if the latter, what Vertue soever they assign to a Figure, it is not the Real Body, nor the Body Really Present. Let them speak plain, that the World may understand them: The Faithful are not to be deluded with Ambiguities in a Point of so great concern to their Immortal Souls.

* Viz. The Author of the Brief Discourse, &c. cited *supra*.

Reader, be pleased to observe concerning the manner and Method of the Ensuing *Treatise* and *Answer*, that the *Discourse against Transubstantiation* is faithfully here reprinted Section by Section, and a Reply made to the Sections in their Order. Also, that because the Discourser against Transubstantiation would delude unwary Christians by making them believe, that Catholics have no proof for this Doctrin from Scripture, this first Part which is chiefly concerning Scripture Authority is publisht by it self, to be consider'd distinctly; to which in convenient time, the Second Part is to be added.

Some E R R A T A ' S to be Corrected.

Pag. 18. in Marg. for *Preface* read *Introducit.* p. 27. last line read *under the species*
p. 42. in the Hebrew Citation, read **יְהִי** bis p. 60. read *Relics*. Observe
that in the Marginal Notes. p. 43. 56, 58, 63. the word, *infra*, hath relation to the
Second Part of the Answer, which is not yet Publisht.

Transub-

Transubstantiation DEFENDED:

In Answer to a
Treatise, Intitled, A Discourse
against Transubstantiation.

DISCOURSE.

Concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, one of the two great positive Institutions of the Christian Religion, there are two main Points of difference between Us and the Church of Rome. One, about the Doctrine of Transubstantiation; in which they think, but are not certain, that they have the Scripture and the words of our Saviour on their side: The other, about the administration of this Sacrament to the People, in both kinds; in which we are sure that we have the Scripture and our Saviour's Institution on our side; and that so plainly, that our Adversaries themselves do not deny it.

ANSWER.

Concerning the Sacrament of Union, the Lord's Supper; which is the chief of those several positive Institutions of Religion which Christ hath Ordained in his Church, there are many great differences

Our Adversary
doth not rightly
State the Point.

B

Transubstantiation Defended.

ences even between Protestants themselves ; it is no wonder therefore if there are as many between Protestants and Catholics : Of these the Author gives two instances , the one about the Doctrine of Transubstantiation , the other about the Administration of this Sacrament to the People in both kinds : As for that of Transubstantiation, he would have done well to have told us, in what supposition he means to take the Word in his Discourse. If he suppose the True, Real and Substantial Presence of Christ's Body in the Sacrament, and take the Word Transubstantiation precisely , as it signifies that Presence, not with the Bread, but by it's being chang'd into his Body, this is a difference indeed, and the only proper one in this supposition, between him and Catholics, in this matter: But then if he would have proceeded sincerely, and as one that was really Master of so much sense as he talks of in this Treatise, he should have held to his Point, and not impugned what he supposes ; but if he suppose no such Real or Substantial Presence of Christ's Body, and under the name of Transubstantiation fight expressly against the Real Presence, through his whole Discourse, as it is evident he doth, (and therefore ought to have call'd it *a Discourse against the Real Presence, and it's consequence Transubstantiation, and not a Discourse only, against Transubstantiation;*) then the difference is not only as he would make it with the Catholics, but with the *Lutherans* also, and those of his own Communion, as King *James*, Bishop *Andrews*, Mr. *Thorndike*, and many others who profess'd to believe the *Body of Christ to be present in the Sacrament no less truly than Catholics do*. But however he compose this difference with them, yet the Catholics, as for their Tenent, do not think only, as he says, but are *certain*, as I shall shew in the Process of this Discourse, that they *have the Words of our Saviour, which they do not doubt to be Scripture, on their side*. And for the other Point, *viz.* the Administration of the Sacrament in both kinds, they are sure that neither he, nor any of his party have, or ever can prove from the Scripture and our Saviour's Institution ,

See two Discourses concerning
the Adoration of
our B. Saviour in
the Sacrament
Printed at Oxford, 1687.

that.

Transubstantiation Defended.

3

that he laid a Command upon all the Faithful to receive it always in both kinds, and this they constantly affirm. But before I leave this Paragraph, I cannot but desire the Reader to take notice of two things, first, That how *sure* soever the Author makes himself, that he hath the *Scripture and our Saviours Institution on his side*, yet his good friend Dr. *Tillotson* in his Rule of Faith, which he makes ^{pag. 1. 3.} Scripture only to be, speaking in his own Name, and that of his Party, saith: *We are not Infallibly certain, that any Book* (for example S. *Matthew* or any other of the Evangelists,) *is so Ancient as it pretends to be, or that it was Written by him whose Name it bears, or that this is the sense of such and such passages in it, it is possible all this may be otherwise.* The second is, how high soever he talk of the Catholics *not* being *certain*, and his own being *sure*, of having the *Scripture* for them, yet he doth not vouchsafe to tell us what he means by that *Word, viz.* whether *express Texts*, or *deductions* only. If *express Texts*: Let him produce one, if he can, for that new Article of his Creed, (a Creed much younger than that of Pope *Pius* the fourth) *I do believe that there is not any Transubstantiation in the Lord's Supper, or in the Elements of Bread and Wine, &c.* If *Deductions* only, Why may not the Catholics, who have the *express Words of Scripture*, *that it is his Body*, infer as surely from thence, that there is a change in the Elements of Bread and Wine, as the Protestants, who have no such *express Text*, *that it is not his Body*, can do to prove, that there is no change?

DISCOURSE.

Of the first of these I shall now treat, and endeavour to shew against the Church of Rome, That in this Sacrament there is no substantial change made of the Elements of Bread and Wine into the natural Body and Blood of Christ; that Body which was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered upon the Cross; for so they explain that hard word Transubstantiation.

Transubstantiation Defended.

ANSWER.

What is meant
by Transubstan-
tiation.

a S. Augustin.
Putaverunt quod
precisum est
Dominus particu-
las quajdam de
corpo suo & da-
turus illis, & dixe-
runt, durus est hic
sermo, ipsi erant
duri, non sermo.
in Psal. 98. ado-
rate scabellum, &c.

Of the former of these I shall now treat, and endeavour to vindicate the Catholic Church, which declares it as an Article of Faith, that *by Virtue of Consecration in the Sacrament, there is a Conversion made of the whole substance of the Bread into the substance of the Body of our Lord, and of the whole substance of the Wine into the substance of his Blood, which Conversion she conveniently and properly calls Transubstantiation, a hard word indeed to those who will not believe the great Mystery expressed by it.*

DISCOURSE.

Before I engage in this Argument, I cannot but observe what an unreasonable task we are put upon, by the bold confidence of our Adversaries, to dispute a matter of Sense; which is one of those things about which Aristotle hath long since pronounc'd there ought to be no dispute.

ANSWER.

The argument
from sense shew'd
to be tenscless.

Before I engage in this Argument, I cannot but observe what an unreasonable task we are put upon by the bold confidence of our Adversary, not to dispute a matter of sense, (since upon this all parties are agreed, that there ought to be no dispute;) but to Answer all the absurdities, which the Author is engaged in by espousing false principles, and among the rest as the chief, that Sense can judge of the internal nature or substance of things: For, all that is the proper object of Sense, that is, the species, or outward accidents of Bread and Wine, are allowed to be present in the Sacrament by all Catholics as well as Separatists: And we strangely admire, that he should not remember that Rule of his Master Aristotle, which every young Scholar learns, in the beginning of his Logick, that *Substantia non incurrit in sensu;*

Transubstantiation Defended.

5

sensus; *Substance is not the object of sense*. From whence it is apparent to all Men that have the use of their Reason, that all the Authors cracking confidence upon this Argument, is founded upon a vulgar Error slyly insinuated, that Catholics believe that which they * *see in the Sacrament of* ^{quod viditis} *the Eucharist, to be the substance of the Body and Blood* ^{panis est & calix,} *of Christ*. But lest any should be deceived with this ^{quod vobis etiam} *popular Argument, and take up a prejudice against us as in* ^{o uli vestri re-} *nunciant, quod au-* ^{tem fides vestra} *good reason they may, since they are made to believe that* ^{postulat instru-} *we would perswade them out of their Senses; I shall be* ^{da, panis est cor-} *so far from endeavouring to do this, as the Author fondly* ^{pus Christi, & ca-} *imagins all Catholics do; that rather out of a deep senti-* ^{liz Singuis ejus.} ^{Augustinus Serm-} *ment of gratitude to the great God of Nature, who hath* ^{al infant.} *so fearfully and wonderfully made these Bodies of ours,* *I shall freely acknowledge that the Senses do not deceive* *us at all. For the deception doth not lie, at any time,* *in the Senses, but in the Judgment, and the Senses do al-* *ways give true hints to the mind, when their Organs and* *the Medium are rightly disposed, and they are employ-* *ed about their proper and adequate Objects. What we* *may certainly conclude from the goodness and veracity of* *God, is, that he will not deceive Man, the Creature that* *he loves, and therefore usually those objects which are* *represented to him by his Senses, as having relation to the* *conservation of his Body, are of such and such a determin-* *ate substance, as the outward and sensible accidents do* *hint them to be of. So that he is not mistaken in them,* *unless he judge rashly, and then too there are means pro-* *vided by which he may correct his Error. Thus the sub-* *stance of Fire is generally represented under the species or* *usual form of Fire: Of a Dove under the usual form or lik-* *ness of a Dove: (So that we may allow in this manner, that* *ordinarily the substance doth incur into the mind through* *the Senses, by means of the accidents, but it is certain that* *the Senses cannot judge either of the substance or accidents.)* *Therefore God who is the Author of Nature, and can* *change it, when he pleaseth, that Man may not be deceived* *in this kind, doth usually inform him, when he maketh any* *substantial*

Transubstantiation Defended.

Substantial change, of this Nature, in his Creatures, which is above the reason of Man to comprehend, from any hints made by his senses, as being truly Miraculous. Thus, when the Holy Ghost appeared in the form of a Dove, Man was informed by God, that it was really the Holy Ghost in substance of Nature, and not a Dove. When the same Holy Spirit descended upon the Apostles in the Visible appearance of Cloven Tongues of Fire; they had notice from Heaven, that this was truly that Holy Spirit which came in this Visible shape. When Angels appeared in the forms of Men; they had it revealed to them, that they were, notwithstanding, Angels. When our Lord presented himself to his Disciples under the species of Bread, he told them plainly, that it was his Body. To shew which Revelation to have been made, from the Authority of Holy Scripture and Fathers, will be the subject of the ensuing Discourse: This which I have here said, being fully conclusive against the Argument of sense's being properly the Judge of substance. And now who is it that abuses the senses, the Author, or Catholics? He, by applying them to judge of substance, which is an object that is no ways adequate to them, would make them to deceive Men. We, employing them about their proper objects, which are here the accidents, or outward species of Bread and Wine, which, as by them we are convinced, do still remain after Consecration, prove the Miracle from sense; because at the same time that these appear, the understanding, being enlightened by Faith, discerns the true and real substance of Christ's Body, to be veiled under them, which makes the thing truly Miraculous. To employ therefore the senses about their true and adequate objects, and the mind about those which are proper to it, is rational: But to advance sense above reason, and even Faith it self; the Beast above the Man, and the Christian too, as the Author doth, is such a piece of Stupidity, as is not to be parallel'd.

Transubstantiation Defended.

7

DISCOURSE.

It might well seem strange if any Man should write a Book, to prove that an Egg is not an Elephant, and that a Musket-bullet is not a Pike: It is every whit as hard a case, to be put to maintain by a long Discourse, that what we see and handle and taste to be Bread is Bread, and not the Body of a Man; and what we see and taste to be Wine is Wine, and not Blood: And if this evidence may not pass for sufficient without any farther proof, I do not see why any Man, that hath confidence enough to do so, may not deny anything to be what all the World sees it is; or affirm any thing to be what all the World sees it is not; and this without all possibility of being farther confuted. So that the business of Transubstantiation is not a controversie of Scripture against Scripture, or of Reason against Reason, but of downright Impudence against the plain meaning of Scripture, and all the Sense and Reason of Mankind.

ANSWER.

Here the Author, like another *Lucian* renouncing the Christian Faith, begins to ridicule the most Sacred Mystery of our Religion. I confess I am very unwilling to follow him in such dirty way as he takes. It is not at all suitable to the retiredness, wherein our Devout minds should be entertained, when we conceive of a thing so truly Divine, to speak slightly. I must intreat therefore the Candid Reader, to abstract his thoughts wholly from the Blessed Sacrament, at such time as any of this froth is cast back again upon the Author, which I heartily wish he had spared me the pains of doing; and that he had kept his Egg and his Elephant to himself: The Analogy would have been more easily made out by those, who maintain that Grace, and Virtue are the Body and Blood of Christ verily and indeed received (for so an Egg is virtually at least an Elephant, if according to the principle of the Philosopher, *Omnia animalia generantur ex ovo*; every Animal is generated.

The Catholic
Faith ridiculed by
the Adversary.

Transubstantiation Defended.

generated out of an Egg) then by such as hold with the Catholic Church, that the Sacrament is not Bread and Wine, but what verily and indeed it is, the Real Body and Blood of Christ. Now, how to change a *Musket-bullet* into a *Pike*, I confess I know not; The Dragoons better understand that piece of Martial exercise. Howsoever, I must needs acknowledge with the Author, that it seems strange, that any Man should write a Book, to prove that an Egg is not an Elephant, and that a *Musket-bullet* is not a *Pike*; therefore it is a thousand pities, that so curious a Wit as his, should be concern'd in so absurd an enterprise as he believes his to be. And yet, Good God, what will not the confident presumption of some Men put them upon! he undertakes a task fully as impossible to be performed as that; and of infinitely more dangerous consequence, to prove that not to be, which by the power of God, is really made to be in the Sacrament. The Author knows, that the Catholic Church grounds this wonderful change, made in the Elements, upon *Divine Revelation*, which depends upon the Veracity of God: So that it will not be so very hard a case, to maintain by a discourse much shorter than this of the Author, even our Lords Words of Institution, that what we see, and handle, and taste as Bread, is not Bread in substance, but the Body of Christ; and what we see and taste as Wine, is not Wine in substance, but the Blood of our Saviour. *And if this evidence may not pass for sufficient without any further proof, I do not see why any Man, that hath confidence enough to do so, may not deny any thing to be what all the World sees it is, or affirm anything to be what all the World sees it is not*, (since the Word of God is more Infallible than our senses) and this without all possibility of being farther confuted; for, he that denies the Veracity of God, can no ways conclude his senses to be veracious. The denial then of the Real Presence, or *Transubstantiation*, is not a *Controversy of Scripture against Scripture, or of Reason against Reason*, but of down-right impudence against the plain meaning of Scripture, and all the sense and reason of Mankind.

DIS.

Transubstantiation Defended.

9

DISCOURSE.

It is a most Self-evident Falsehood; and there is no Doctrin or Proposition in the World that is of it self more evidently true, than Transubstantiation is evidently false: And yet if it were possible to be true, it would be the most ill natur'd and pernicious truth in the World, because it would suffer nothing else to be true; it is like the Roman-Catholic Church, which will needs be the whole Christian Church, and will allow no other Society of Christians to be any part of it: So Transubstantiation, if it be true at all, it is all truth; for it cannot be true unless our Senses and the Senses of all Mankind be deceived about their proper objects; and if this be true and certain, then nothing else can be so; for if we be not certain of what we see, we can be certain of nothing.

ANSWER.

The Doctrin of the real Presence or Transubstantiation is a Truth that is evident upon the Authority of the Revealer; and there is no Opinion that the Author holds is more evidently false, than this is evidently true: For Faith is the evidence of things not seen, Heb. 11. 1. and the best natur'd truth in the World it is, which conveys us infinite blessings: Which unless it be so, we have no reason to believe any thing else to be true; a Truth like that of the Catholic Church, which, unless it be that which hath lived in Communion with, and just obedience to her chief Pastors, especially St. Peter and his lawful Successors in the See of Rome, then there hath been no true Church upon the face of the Earth: For so the real Presence or Transubstantiation, unless it be true, we cannot be assured of any truth: It must be so if God be veracious, that is, unless what he reveals be false; since the very truth of our Senses, and all our Faculties, depends upon his Veracity; and if we be not certain of what he hath revealed, though it seem to contradict our Senses, we are certain of nothing.

The Real Presence depends on Gods Veracity.

C

DIS-

Transubstantiation Defended.

DISCOURSE.

And yet notwithstanding all this, there is a Company of men in the World so abandon'd and given up by God to the efficacy of delusion, as in good earnest to believe this gross and palpable Error, and to impose the belief of it upon the Christian World under no less penalties than of temporal death and eternal damnation. And therefore to undeceive, if possible, these deluded Souls, it will be necessary to examine the pretended grounds of so false a Doctrin, and to lay open the monstrous Absurdity of it.

ANSWER.

No-transubstantiation an Article of Faith with our Adversaries, and establisht with Penalties.

See the Penal Laws and Tests.

And yet notwithstanding all this, there is a Sect of men in the World, so abandon'd and given up by God to the efficacy of delusion, as confidently to deny this revealed truth, and to impose this strange Negative Article of Faith of theirs, That in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper there is not any Transubstantiation of the Elements of Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, at or after Consecration by any person whatsoever, under no less penalties, than the temporal loss of their Estates and Livelihoods, the loss of their Lives, the formal renouncing of the Catholic Faith and Religion, which is dearer to them than their Lives, and consequently Eternal damnation. Therefore to undeceive, (which we hope is possible,) these deluded Souls, it will be necessary to shew the real grounds upon which Transubstantiation is built, that so the monstrous absurdity of the contrary Doctrin may be made to appear.

DISCOURSE.

And in the handling of this Argument, I shall proceed in this plain method.

I. I shall consider the pretended grounds and reasons of the Church of Rome for this Doctrin.

II. I shall produce our Objections against it. And if I can:

Transubstantiation Defended.

ii

can shew that there is no tolerable ground for it, and that there are invincible Objections against it, then every man is not only in reason excused from believing this Doctrin, but hath great cause to believe the contrary.

FIRST, I will consider the pretended grounds and reasons of the Church of Rome for this Doctrin. Which must be one or more of these five. Either 1st. The Authority of Scripture. Or 2ly. The perpetual belief of this Doctrin in the Christian Church, as an evidence that they always understood and interpreted our Saviour's words, This is my Body, in this Sense. Or 3ly. The Authority of the present Church to make and declare new Articles of Faith. Or 4ly. The absolute necessity of such a change as this in the Sacrament, to the comfort and benefit of those who receive this Sacrament, Or 5ly. To magnifie the power of the Priest, in being able to work so great a Miracle.

1st. They pretend for this Doctrin the Authority of Scripture in those words of our Saviour, This is my Body. Now to shew the insufficiency of this pretence, I shall endeavour to make good these two things.

1. That there is no necessity of understanding those words of our Saviour in the sense of Transubstantiation.

2. That there is a great deal of reason to understand them otherwise.

A N S W E R.

In the handling of this Argument I shall proceed in this plain method.

The Method of
the ensuing Discourse.

I. I shall consider the solid grounds and reasons of the Catholic Church for this Doctrin.

II. I shall weigh the Objections which the Author makes against it. And if I can shew that there is a real ground for it, and that the Objections against it are weak, and incon siderable, then every man is not only in reason obliged to believe it, but hath great cause to reject the contrary.

First, I shall consider the solid grounds and reasons of the Catholic Church for this Doctrin. Which are at least these five. 1st. The Authority of Scripture. 2ly. The per-

Transubstantiation Defended.

real belief of this Doctrin in the Christian Church, as an evidence that they always understood and interpreted our Saviours words, This is my Body, in this Sense. Or 3ly. The Authority of the Church in every Age to declare, propose, and exhibit, when, by misinterpretation of Heretics, they are forc'd to it, a more explicit Sense of the Ancient Articles of our Faith. Or 4ly. The infinite Mercy and condescension of God to operate such a change as this, for the comfort and benefit of those who receive this Sacrament. Or 5ly. The just dignity of the Priest, whom God is pleas'd to make use of as his Minister for the working so miraculous a change.

1st. The Catholic Church hath always grounded the Doctrin of the Real Presence or Transubstantiation upon the Authority of Divine Revelation in these words of our Saviour, *This is my Body*. Now to shew the validity of this Proof I shall endeavour to make good these two things.

I. That there is a necessity of understanding these words of our Saviour in the Sense of the Real Presence, or Transubstantiation. From whence it will necessarily follow,

II. That there is no reason at all for the understanding them otherwise.

DISCOURSE.

First, That there is no necessity to understand those words of our Saviour in the sense of Transubstantiation. If there be any, it must be from one of these two Reasons. Either because there are no figurative expressions in Scripture, which I think no man ever yet said: or else, because a Sacrament admits of no figures; which would be very absurd for any man to say, since it is of the very nature of a Sacrament to represent and exhibit some invisible grace and benefit by an outward sign and figure: And especially since it cannot be denied, but that in the institution of this very Sacrament our Saviour useth figurative expressions and several words which cannot be taken strictly and literally. When he gave the Cup, he said, This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of Sins. Where first, the Cup is put for Wine.

Transubstantiation Defended.

13

Wine contained in the Cup; or else if the words be literally taken, so as to signify a substantial change, it is not of the Wine but of the Cup; and that, not into the Blood of Christ, but into the New Testament, or new Covenant in his Blood. Besides, that his Blood is said then to be shed, and his Body to be broken, which was not till his Passion, which followed the Institution and first celebration of this Sacrament.

A N S W E R.

First, That there is a necessity of understanding those words of our Saviour in the Sense of the Real Presence or Transubstantiation, For these two Reasons. 1. Because although there be many figurative expressions in Scripture, which all men allow, yet this, in relation to the Case in hand, is not such. 2. Although a Sacrament admires of Figures, which no man is so absurd as to deny, since it is of the very nature of a Sacrament, to represent and exhibit some invisible grace and benefit by an outward Sign and Figure; Yet the Figure doth not lie where the Author pretends it doth. The Rule which men ought to observe in their discourse in relation to Figures is this, That a Figure should not be used which the Auditor doth not easily apprehend to be so. To compare, therefore, a Figure, which all the World can easily understand to be so, with an expression which no man can construe to be a Figure, according to the Rules of human Discourse, is very absurd: Yet such is the Authors instance from Scripture. From whence he alledgedeth, that when our Saviour gave the Cup, he said, *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, which is shed, (or more properly pour'd out) for you, and for many, for the remission of Sins.* Did not our Lord plainly read in the minds of his Disciples, that, by the Cup, they would understand, that which was contained in the Cup? If any one should advise the Author, when he is thirsty, to drink off his Glass, would he be so inconsiderate as to swallow it together with the Wine? Nay further, so unhappy is the Author, as to urge this instance of holy Scripture in the first place, which alone is enough

The necessity of understanding our Lords words in the Sense of the Real Presence.

Transubstantiation Defended.

enough fully to clear the Point against him. Neither the Apostles, nor any men else could be so ignorant of the manner of human discourse, as not to apprehend, that our Saviour, by the *Cup*, meant what was contained in it, which was most certainly Christ's Blood; for otherwise it could not be said of it, as it is *Luke 22. 20.* that it was then *poured out* for the Apostles, and *for many, for the remission of Sins*: it is said, *is poured out*, in the Present Tense; not, *shall be poured out*, in the Future; therefore here can be meant, only the Blood of Christ, as now poured out in the Sacrament for them, not as it was afterwards shed from his Crucified Body upon the ground. The Original runs thus,

Luke 22. 20.

τέτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καὶ ἡ διαθήκη, ἐν τῷ εἰμαὶ με, τὸ ὑπερ υἱοῦ ἐνχυρόμενον: Where in construction *ἐνχυρόμενον* agrees with *ποτήριον*, and not with *εἰμαὶ*. And Wine as a Figure only of Christ's Blood, or signifying its virtue, could not be poured out for the remission of Sins: You might with more congruity of Speech, affirm of an Image of the Blessed Virgin, * *This is that which conceived the Son of God*; because in this there is some plain resemblance to the Prototype. *Beza* a great Critic, in his way, though an Adversary to the Catholic Doctrin in this Point, not being able to deny this Proof, would rather have the Scripture to be thought false, although that be the whole Foundation of their Faith, than change his Opinion; and faith, that it is a * *Solecism*, and should be *ἐνχυρόν*: He concludes that the holy Spirit, or *St. Luke*, that divinely inspired Pen-man, the most eloquent of all the Evangelists, could be sooner mistaken, though in a matter of so great moment, than himself; or else he would have the Scripture to be falsified, and corrupt, in this place, and not himself. For he acknowledges that all the ancient Manuscripts which he had seen, and even his own, which was of great Authority, and of *venerable Antiquity, veneranda Antiquitatis*, together with the *Syriac Version*, to which he gives this Elogy, that it was deservedly accounted to be of *greatest authority, maxima merito autoritatis*, did conspire together, to refer the effusion of Blood to the *Cup*. The Anthon, therefore, and all that separate from the Catholic Church

** Solecophanes.*

** hoc Simulacrum
est virgo quod fi-
lum Dei peperit.*

in this Point, must either, at last, be forced to confess here, as * Beza doth concerning those words of our Lord, *This is my Body, That this saying thus express cannot be retained, but it must prove Transubstantiation, after the manner of the Papists;* or else that the Holy Scripture, the Foundation of Christian Faith, is made invalid: So that it is plain from what hath been said, that the *Cup is here put for what is contained in the Cup,* and that the words, so taken, do signify, and operate a substantial Change, not of the *Cup,* but of the Wine in the *Cup;* and that, not into the *New Testament, or Covenant,* but into the *Blood of Christ,* in which this *New Covenant, or Testament* is made, sealed and confirmed. Besides, that his *Blood is said, here, then to be poured out, and his Body, then to be broken, and given for us,* which they could not be unless they were then really in the Sacrament; because the *Passion,* (wherein * his Body was peirced only, not broken, as in the Sacrament, and his Blood was shed from his Crucified Body upon the ground, not only poured forth from one Vessel to another, and drunk as in the Sacrament,) followed the Institution and first Celebration of this Sacrament.

Contra Webster: Hoc quidem saepe diximus, quod nunc quoque reperiam, regnandi regula non posse, τὸ πν̄ τὸν in his Christi verbis, hoc est corpus meum: quin Transubstantiationis papistica statuatur.

Compare

** Job. 19. 36. A bone of him shall not be broken, with 1 Cor. 11. 24. This is my Body which is broken for you. Which gave occasion to St. Chrysostome to say of Christ, that that which he did not suffer upon the Cross for the love of thee, he suffers in the Eucharist: This is my Body which is broken for you.*

DISCOURSE.

But that there is no necessity to understand our Saviour's words in the sense of Transubstantiation, I will take the plain concession of a great number of the most learned Writers of the Church of Rome in this Controversie. (a) Bellarmin, (b) Suarez and (c) Vasques do acknowledg Scotus the great Schoolman to have said that this Doctrin cannot be evidently proved from Scripture: And Bellarmin grants this not to be improbable; and Suarez and Vasques acknowledg (d) Durandus to have said as much. (e) Ocham, another famous Schoolman, says expressly, that the Doctrin which holds the Substance of the Bread and Wine to remain after Consecration is neither repugnant to Reason nor to Scripture. (f) Petrus ab Alliaco, Cardinal of Cambray, says plainly, That the Doctrin of the Substance of Bread and Wine remaining after Consecration

- (a) *de Euch. l. 3. c. 2.*
- (b) *in 3. dif. 49. Q. 75. Sol. 2.*
- (c) *in 3. part. disp. 180. Q. 75. art. 2. c. 5.*
- (d) *in Senti. l. 4. dif. 11. Q. 1. n. 15.*
- (e) *in 4. Senti. Q. 5. & Q. 4. n. 4.*
- (f) *in 4. Senti. Q. 6. art. 2.*

Transubstantiation Defended.

Consecration is more easie, and free from Absurdity, more rational and no ways repugnant to the Authority of Scripture; *nay more, that for the other Doctrin, viz. of Transubstantiation, there is no evidence in Scripture.* (g) Gabriel Biel, *another great Schoolman and Divine of their Church, freely declares, that as to any thing express'd in the Canon of the Scriptures, a man may believe that the substance of Bread and Wine doth remain after Consecration: and therefore he resolves the belief of Transubstantiation into some other Revelation besides Scripture, which he supposeth the Church had about it.* Cardinal (h)

(h) *In Aquin. 3 part. Qu. 75. art. 1.* Cajetan confesseth that the Gospel doth no where express that the Bread is changed into the Body of Christ; that we have this from the Authority of the Church: *Nay, he goes farther, That there is nothing in the Gospel which enforceth any man to understand these words of Christ, this is my Body, in a proper and not a metaphorical Sense; but the Church having understood them in a proper Sense, they are to be so explained: Which words in the Roman E-*

(i) *Agid. Contra c. 1. de Sacram. Q. 75 art. 1 n. 13.* edition of Cajetan are expunged by order of Pope (i) Pius V. Cardinal (k) Contarenus, and (l) Melchior Canus one of (k) *de Sacram. l. 2 c. 3.* the best and most judicious Writers that Church ever had, reckon (l) *Loc. Theolog. l. 3. c. 3.* this Doctrin among those which are not so expressly found in Scripture. I will add but one more, of great authority in (m) *Contra c. 1. de Sacram. Babylon c. 10. n. 2.* the Church, and a reputed Martyr, (m) Fisher Bishop of Rochester, who ingenuously confesseth, that in the words of the Institution there is not one word from whence the true Presence of the Flesh and Blood of Christ in our Mass can be proved: So that we need not much contend, that this Doctrin hath no certain foundation in Scripture, when this is so fully and frankly acknowledged by our Adversaries themselves.

ANSWER.

The Sense of the Schoolmen corrupted and their problematical Discourse n. 1. staken for their Conclusion by the Adversary.

The Author hath had very little Success yet, in that, which he calls, a Discourse against Transubstantiation; therefore because he would now do some Execution, he is forc't

Transubstantiation Defended.

17

forc't to come down to his Adversaries to sharpen his blunt Weapons. Which, notwithstanding will prove no advantage to his Cause. He here, then, tells us in his first Period, That he will take the plain Concession of a great number of the most Learned Writers of the Church of Rome in this Controversie, that there is NO necessity to understand our Saviour's Words in the Sense of Transubstantiation. But what if it manifestly appear from the Words of these Writers, that he takes this by force, which they never gave him; since they all thought themselves bound to accept the Words in that Sense which they acknowledge the Church to have given of them, as deducible from Scripture by necessary Consequence, tho' not so plainly prov'd from the bare Words, consider'd by themselves, as you shall see from their Authorities hereunder cited? Then he proceeds, like a false Master of the Horse, to make up the number of his List, by calling Men that are not in it, to answer to other Names than their own. *Bellarmin, Suarez, and Vasquez do acknowledge Scotus, &c.* Again, *Bellarmin grants this not to be improbable; and Suarez and Vasquez acknowledge Durandus to have said as much.* Here they are wheel'd about a second time to make the greater Show; yet there are but two Men in effect after all this calling. The Author says, *Bellarmin, and Suarez, and Vasquez say, Such a Man said such a Thing: Why, such a blundering sort of an Evidence would be flung out of any inferior Court of Judicature; it faulters so manifestly at the very beginning, that we may assure ourselves it can never speak clearly.* Let us see therefore what * *Scotus* saith for himself; his Words are these: *If you say that Christ, by saying This is my Body, doth plainly teach us, that the Bread doth not remain, for then the Proposition would be false; this is not convenient: for supposing (so that 'tis but a Supposition still) the Substance of Bread did still remain, the Substance of Bread is not demonstrated here, but what is contain'd under the Bread, as now the Accidents are shew'd, for then the Proposition would be false; but the Sense is, that which shall be contain'd under this sensible Sign, is my Body.* Mark, how much *Scotus* fa-

See all the Citations above in the Margin of the Author's last Section as they are plac'd in order.

D

vors

Si dicas, quod Christus, dicendo, hoc est corpus meum, expresse instruit, non reminere, quia tunc esset propositionis falsa, hoc non cogit, quia dato quod substantia panis minaretur, non demonstratur substantia panis, sed contentum sub pane; sicut modo. monstrans accidentis, quia si hoc esset propositionis falsa, sed est sensus, hoc quod erit contentum sub signo sensibili est corpus meum.

Transubstantiation Defended.

vors the Author's Opinion of the Senses being Judges of what is in the Sacrament. Again he saith, (a) *The truth of some things that are to be believ'd, is more explicitly set down than in the Apostolic, Athanasian, or Nicene Creed; and in brief, whatsoever is (by the Catholic Church) propos'd to our Belief, is to be held of the substance of Faith, after a solemn Declaration made by the Church;* he gives the Reason afterwards, *Because the Scriptures are Expounded by the same Spirit by which they were made:* And thus he concludes, telling us in plain terms, *That the Church therefore chose this Sense of Transubstantiation, because it is true; for it was not in the Power of the Church to make it true or false, but of God Instituting it: But the Church Explain'd the Sense which was deliver'd by God.* And if it be so, that Transubstantiation was the true Sense, and that before the Declaration of the Council, then there was a necessity to understand our Saviour's Words in the Sense of Transubstantiation, according to *Scotus*, as well before as after the Council, since 'twas the Sense deliver'd by God. Therefore when the Author saith he hath the plain Concession of a great number of the most Learned Writers of the Church of Rome, reckoning *Scotus* in the first place, *that there is NO necessity to understand our Saviour's Words in the Sense of Transubstantiation,* he saith that which is not true. *Bellarmin* indeed grants what *Scotus* said of the substance of Bread remaining (notwithstanding its being converted into the substance of Christ's Body, as I shall presently shew) that it is not *ALTOGETHER* improbable, *Non omnino improbabile*, altho' there may be great Improbability in the thing notwithstanding, (mark the

* Word which the Author is pleas'd to leave out) *that there is no place of Scripture extant so express, as that, without the Declaration of the Church (which notwithstanding clears the whole matter) can evidently compel us to admit of Transubstantiation, viz. in the Sense of the Thomists, whose way of Explication of it is somewhat different from *Scotus's*.* But that not being of Faith, there ought to be no Controversie about it, and therefore the * Council of Trent directly Condemn'd neither of these Ways.

* See the Preface to this Discourse.

Ways. And (b) Durandus himself after he has Dis- (b) *Durandus*
cours'd Problematically upon the Point, like a Schoolman, *Tria solide por-*
at last concludes solidly: That *that is not always to be cho-* *nit. Primo, quod*
sen in matters of Faith, which hath fewest difficulties conse- *substantia panis*
quent to it--- That the substance of Bread and Wine is chang'd *& vini conver-*
into the substance of Christ's Body: That that only is princi- *titur in sub-*
pally effected in this Sacrament, which is signified by the form *stutism corporis*
of the words, viz. of Consecration. Which Argument being *Christi. Secun-*
urg'd by him from Scripture for Transubstantiation, is a *do, quod medi-*
plain Evidence that he did not deny the necessity of under- *ante tali conver-*
standing our Saviours words in that Sense: For he concludes *sione corpus &*
positively from Scripture, *that both these things are made* *sanguis Christi*
to be in this Sacrament, viz. The Existence of the Body of *virtute Divina*
Christ and the Conversion of the Bread into it: And what is *habet talon ordinum seu*
this but Transubstantiation? Therefore what the Authors *tributum alspec-*
abovemention'd say concerning *Scotus* and *Durandus*, is to be *sub quibus*
applied rather to their particular manner of explicating *perverunt panis &*
the Doctrin of Transubstantiation, than to the thing it self, *vicum quod sunt*
since many (c) other Authors do not think them to be mi- *ei realiter pre-*
staken in the Point. *series. Tertio,*
per eligendum illud a. quod sequuntur pauciores difficultates, &c. 2. Quod illud solum efficiatur in hoc
Sacramento p. i. cipaliter, quod significatur p. r. formam verborum. — utrumque efficiatur in hoc
Sacramento, scilicet Existencia corporis Christi & conversio panis. (c) So he that writes the Scholia upon this Author,
ib. n. 13. Vana sunt ergo que ex hoc Suarez & Sotus objiciunt contra Scotum, cui falso imponit. Sed si, quod
afferat Ecclesiam acceptisse Transubstantiationem a Doctoribus. Viz. etiam Card. Perot. De his auto-
ritatibus.

(d) Ocham seems to allow, that the substance of Bread (d) *Ochamus.*
may remain tho' it forsake its accidents, and the substance *In altari est vera,*
of Christ's Body doth not forsake them; and this according to *transubstantiatione*
him was one way of solving Transubstantiation, which he *corporis Christi,*
is far from saying to be contrary either to Reason or *sed hic potest mul-*
Scripture. *tis modis ponit.*

corpus Christi coexistit substantie illi, ita quod primi substantia sit deferens accidentia, Secunda non, sed
tanquam coexistens: alio modo quod recedat substantia panis subito de illo loco ad alium locum, & remanent
accidentia, & eis coexistat corpus Christi. Tertio, quod re-ligatur in materiam per se stantem, viz. aliam for-
man recipientem, & hoc sive in eadem sive in alio, & iure illi materie & accidentibus coexistat corpus Christi.
Quarto, quod substantia panis redigatur in nihil. Quodlibet isorum est possibile.

Transubstantiation Defended.

(e) Petrus ab Alliaco Card.
Tertia, opinio fuit, quod substantia panis reminetur; & hoc potest dupliciter imaginari, uno modo: — quod renatur ibidem ubi corpus Christi incipit esse, & sic diceretur substantia panis transire in substan-
tia corporis: startiam corporis: quoniam ubi est

hoc, incipit esse illa, &c — prior qualem ille modus est fossilis, nec repugnat rationi, nec auctoritati Biblie, uno est facilior ad intelligendum, & rationali-
or quam aliquis eorum.

(f) Gabriel Biel.
Quamvis expresse indicatur in Scriptura, quod corpus Christi veritatem sub speciebus panis conseretur, & a similibus similitur, nonnunquammodo ibi sit Christi corpus, non per conversionem alicujus in ipsum: an sine conversione in ipsius esse corpus Christi: cum sane alicujus sub-
stancia & acci-
-entibus panis, non inveneri possit in Canonice Biblie.

(f) Gabriel Biel tells us, that although it be expressly deliver'd in Scripture, that the Body of Christ is truly contain'd under the Species of Bread, and receiv'd by the Faithful, yet it is not found expressly in the Canon of the Bible, how the Body of Christ is there, whether by the Conversion of something into it: or whether the Body of Christ begins to be with the Bread without Conversion, the substance and accidents of the Bread remaining; But he doth not deny the former of these ways to be necessarily deduc'd from Scripture; and therefore this Authority makes nothing against us. Cardinal Cajetan's words were censur'd and expunged by Authority, and therefore ought not to be brought against us.

(g) Contarenus
Cardinal.
Omnes Theologi converunt, licet non sit propositum in Scripturis, rationis iamen dictum sequentes, quod fieri istud non queat motu locali, sed mutatione qua-
dam substantie panis in corpus Christi, quam appellant Transubstantiationem.

(g) Cardinal Contarenus freely declares, that all Divines agree, although it be not plainly deliver'd, viz. not in express words, yet following Reason as their Guide (and what is this but necessary rational deduction?) That this (viz. which is done in the Sacrament) cannot be effected by a local motion, but by some change of the substance of Bread into the Body of Christ, which is call'd Transubstantiation?

(h) Melchior

Transubstantiation Defended.

21

(h) *Melchior Canus* doth acknowledg that the Church ^(b) hath by the Spirit of Truth explain'd some things which are accounted obscure in the Holy Writings, and that She doth justly judge the Authors of the contrary Opinions to be Heretics. But things may be necessarily contain'd in Scripture, altho' with some obscurity. So that there is not so much as one of these Authors, (unless it be that which is condemn'd by the Church, and therefore in that Point is none of ours) who hath told us, That there is no necessity to understand our Saviours Words in the Sense of Transubstantiation.

Lastly, As if that true Martyr Bishop Fisher, had not suffer'd enough already, the Author exercises further cruelty against him, by a false and imperfect recital of his words, and corrupting their Sense. This Holy Bishop indeed, speaking of the words of Institution, saith:

(a) *Tbere is not one word put here, by which it can be prov'd, that in OUR Mass the true Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ is made to be, which last words, Is made to be,* The Author falsely renders by these words, can be proved. But this good Martyr doth not say, that Christs words of Institution are not to be understood in the Sense of the True and Real Presence of his Body, as made to be in that Sacrament which our Lord himself Consecrated; but that the Power of Priests, NOW, to Consecrate in our Mass after the same manner, is not express'd in the bare words of Institution; And it is evident from the immediately following words of this Reverend Bishop, that this is his true Sense, which words run thus: *For altho' Christ made of the Bread his Flesh, and of the Wine his Blood, it doth not therefore follow by vertue of any word here plac'd, that WE shall effect the same as often as we endeavor it:* As is also plain from the other words of this Reverend Authors in the same Chapter. *Without the Interpretation of the Fathers, and the usage of the Church by them deliver'd down unto us, no body will prove out of the bare words of Scripture, that any Priest can Consecrate the true Body and Blood of Christ.* ---- For, although we allow Christ to have said (what

(b) *Melchior Canus. Nonnulla per spiritum veritatis explicit Ecclesiæ, que in Sacris literis habentur obscura.* — *Ecclesia hereticorum judicat contr. orum dignissimum Authorum.*

(a) *De Evangelii loquens, ait, neque ullum bic verbum positum est quo probetur, in nostra missa veram fieri carnis & sanguinis Christi presentiam. Nam esti Christus ex pane carnem suam, & ex vino sanguinem efficerit, non ob id consequitur virtute aliquius verbi bic positi nos quieties id ipsius tenebrarum, idem effecturos. ib. cap. 10. not. 2. Edit. Wirceburgi A. 1513. XCVII.*

Circa Patrum interpretationem, & ipsius nobis ab eisdem irriduum, nemo probat ex

Transubstantiation Defended.

*ipsis natis Evan-
gelii verbis Sacer-
dotem quenquam
veram christi
carnem & san-
guinem confe-
crare.—*

*Nam ut largia-
musr. Christum A-
postolis dixisse, ut
ex Luca & Paul'e,
non pro; tera
consequitur quod
immissus eorum
postoris eandem
tradididerit potesta-
tem. Nam illa
data fuit potestas
ejicendi demo-
nes.*

*(b) Contra Cap-
itulat. Babil.
C 4. n. 11. De
Patribus Concilii
Lateranensis
quarti loquens.*

*Si substancia panis
in Christi corpus
convertatur quem-
admodum illi
definierunt, non
debuit aliter
dixisse Christus
quam dixerit. Si
maneat substancia
panis, quanquam
tunc aliter dixisse
Christus debuerat,
tamen per unius
adjectionem vo-
cata potuisset to-
tam banc discor-
diam fusiulisse.
Nam si dixisset
Eius panis est corpus
meum, hoc vinum
est sanguis meus,
Omnis omnino
sublata fuit con-
troversia.*

Scripture faith he did in this kind) to the Apostles out of Luke and Paul, it doth not therefore follow, that he gave the same Power to all that were to succeed them, for a Power of casting out Devils was given to the Apostles. But that this Learned and Pious Bishop asserted the change of the substance of the Bread into the Body of Christ to be the necessary Sense of the words of Christ, *This is my Body*, is clear from these words of his: (b) *If the Substance, faith he, of Bread is changed into Christ's Body, Christ ought not to have said otherwise than he hath said*: And again, *If the substance of Bread remain, then Christ ought to have spoke otherwise*. We must take notice, that this Pious Bishop was defending Tradition as necessary for the Interpretation of some places of Scripture, and particularly such which relate to the Power that those who succeed the Apostles have to Consecrate, and upon very good Grounds, since without Tradition, we cannot conclude the Scripture it self to be the Word of God; and no Church can prove the Succession of her Pastors to this high Function, which is without doubt a Fundamental Point. Since therefore the Protestants hold, that there is a lawful Succession of Pastors in Gods Church, as necessary to the Salvation of Mankind, as evidently deduced from Scripture, interpreted by Tradition, tho' not from the bare words of the Institution of the Eucharist, no less than Catholics; and that they have as full a Right to Consecrate as the Apostles themselves, they must therefore allow that they do do so: And then there can be no doubt rais'd from the words of this holy Bishop, but that Christ's Body and Blood are truly in the Sacrament by way of Transubstantiation, which Doctrin he allows to have a certain Foundation in Scripture. But the Author here would rather pull down the Pillars on which the Church of Christ stands, by interrupting the Episcopal Succession, and undermine its very Foundation, than not set a Face upon his Argument, that he may thereby delude unwary Christians. Upon the whole matter, it is plain from what hath been said; 1. That not any of these Catholic Authors, which

which are cited, held that there was *no necessity* to understand our Saviours words in the Sense of Transubstantiation, but the contrary. 2. That they indeed differed only about some curious Speculations concerning the Dependences and Circumstances of this Doctrin of Transubstantiation, which they Discours'd of in a Problematical way; as for instance; Whether this Transubstantiation is a Mutation and Transubstantiation Productive, that is to say, by virtue of which the Substance of the Body is produc'd from the Substance of Bread; or a Mutation and Transubstantiation Adductive, that is to say, by virtue of which the Substance of Bread ceases to be; and that of the Body be Introdu'd in it's place: And whether in this Adductive Transubstantiation, the Cessation of the Substance of Bread and Wine, is to be call'd Annihilation; or whether it ought to be exempt from this Name, for as much as, altho' it cease to be, nevertheless this Cessation of it's Essence hath not Non-entity for it's final Term, but the Substitution of the Essence of the Body of Christ, or the like; and such kind of disputes which did not at all relate to the Essence of the Article of Transubstantiation, but only to some consequences, and modes of it; for all the School-men agree, That the Bread and Wine are chang'd and Transubstantiated into the Body and Blood of Christ, by virtue of Consecration, the Substances of Bread and Wine ceasing to be, and those of the Body and Blood being substituted in their place. 3. They evidently deduce the Essential part of the Doctrin of Transubstantiation from Scripture; and altho' some few of them do sometimes say, that the bare words of Scripture do not *compell us* to believe the less material consequences of it, yet they do not deny that these also may be rationally deduc'd. 4. The Author doth not pretend to prove from these Authorities, that these Writers did not hold the Real Presence of Christs Body here, but only a sign and virtue of it, as Protestants do, since it is clear from all their Writings, that they did hold it, as proved from Scripture. Altho' I might have sav'd my self the trouble

of

Transubstantiation Defended.

of clearing this point so largely, had I not thought it convenient rather for the vindication of these Writers, whom the Author hath so grossly abused, than for the defending the Doctrin of the Real Presence or Transubstantiation. For what if seven Authors should before the Solemn Declaration of the Church have denied it to be necessarily proved from Scripture, tho' really they have not; Are there not seventy times seven of another mind? Were not the *Arian* Bishops, the *Semi-Pelagians* and other Heretics, who at several times oppos'd the Articles of the Christian Faith, vastly more numerous? And the Author knows, that Catholic Christians are not to rely upon the Judgment of any inconsiderable number of private Doctors Opinions concerning the Sense of an Article of Religion, but upon the Judgment of the generality of Catholic Fathers, which is discerned in their Writings, and in the Decisions of the most General Councils, and in the constant and general Tradition of the Church.

DISCOURSE.

Secondly, *If there be no necessity of understanding our Saviour's words in the Sense of Transubstantiation, I am sure there is a great deal of reason to understand them otherwise.* Whether we consider the like Expressions in Scripture; as where our Saviour says he is the Door, and the true Vine (which the Church of Rome would mightily have triumph'd in, had it been said, This is my true Body.) And so likewise where the Church is said to be Christ's Body; and the Rock which follow'd the Israelites to be Christ, 1 Cor. 10. 4. They drank of that rock which follow'd them, and that rock was Christ: All which and innumerable more like Expressions in Scripture every Man understands in a Figurative, and not in a strictly Literal and absurd Sense. And it is very well known, that in the Hebrew Language things are commonly said to be that which they do signify and represent; and there is not in that Language a more proper and usual way of expressing a thing to signify so and so, than to say that it is so and so. Thus Joseph Expounding

ing

ing Pharaoh's Dream to him, Gen. 41. 26. says, The seven good Kine are seven years, and the seven good Ears of Corn are seven years, that is, they signifi'd or represented seven years of plenty; and so Pharaoh understood him, and so would any Man of Sense understand the like Expressions; nor do I believe that any sensible Man, who had never heard of Transubstantiation being grounded upon these words of our Saviour, This is my Body, would upon reading the Institution of the Sacrament in the Gospel ever have imagin'd any such thing to be meant by our Saviour in those words; but would have understood his meaning to have been, this Bread signifies my Body, this Cup signifies my Blood; and this which you see me now do, do ye hereafter for a Memorial of me: But surely it would never have entred into any man's Mind to have thought that our Saviour did literally hold himself in his Hand, and give away himself from himself with his own Hands.

A N S W E R.

Secondly, Since there is a necessity of understanding our Saviours words in the Sense of the Real Presence, or Transubstantiation, I am sure there can be no reason given to understand them otherwise. For if we consider the expressions which the Author produceth out of Scripture as resembling these, they are so far from being like them, that from thence we shall prove the quite contrary to what the Author alledgedeth them for: Therefore, to reduce this Head of Discourse to some Method; I shall first lay down the Principles by which it is to be governed, that I may the better afterwards draw my Conclusion.

The Disparity between the Figurative expressions in H. Scripture and the words of Institution, This is my Body, shews that the latter are to be taken properly.

1. Christ ever spake reasonably, and in a manner conformable to good Sense, nothing escaping him through imprudence or mistake.

Principles upon which the ensuing Discourse is grounded.

See M. Arnaud Tom. 2. 1, 1. 2, 3. Jus de la re.

2. His Power infinitely exceeds the capacity of our minds; therefore it is against reason, that we should confine it to the narrow bounds of our understanding, or pretend that God cannot do what we cannot conceive.

Transubstantiation Defended.

3. When the Sense of the words which Christ speaks, if taken properly, is not contradictory to Right Reason, tho' above it, and the Rules of human Discourse oblige us to take these words in the proper Sense, then we are not to doubt of the Truth of them as so taken.

How Catholics
Interpret the
words of Institu-
tion, and how
Protestants.

That we may the better apply these Principles, and the ensuing Discourse to the Case in hand, I shall endeavor to State it as precisely as may be, and draw it into as narrow a compass as I can. Christ in the Institution of the Blessed Sacrament said, *THIS IS MY BODY*: Which words Those of the English Church, that do not believe the Presence of Christs Real Body in the Sacrament, yet Attribute the efficacy thereof to the due Reception of the Sacramental Elements (and I will Charitably suppose the Author to be one of these) interpret thus: This thing, which you see to be Bread in Substance, is a Sign of my Real Body, wherein the virtue of my Body, tho' it self be absent, is contained; or whereunto this virtue is conjoined, or together with which it is exhibited; which several sorts of expressions I am forc't to use, that I may by some of them reach that Sense which they have not yet sufficiently explained. Catholics thus: This thing, which by the means of your Senses, is represented to the mind under the Species or Appearance of Bread, is my Body in Substance.

In these Explications, I say, that by, *This*, in the Proposition, *This is my Body*, is meant, *this thing*; because *this* is a Pronoun Demonstrative, that doth not express any particularly determinate, and distinct Nature or Substance: For it may be applied to any thing that is the object of Sense, or of pure Understanding, when it is but confusedly represented to the mind: As we say pointing to a person before us, *This is John*, or *this is Thomas*, pointing to an Animal, we say, *This is a Lamb*, *this is a Dove*; after we have discoursed of the nature of the Soul, we may say of *Cognition*, conceiving it in our minds, *This is the property of the Soul*. But because it would be great rashness of judgment, and that which is strictly called prejudice,

Transubstantiation Defended.

27

prejudice, to conclude fully of the nature of any thing, which another, that is presumed to know it better than we do, should be shewing to us, before he hath fully pronounced his Proposition, by which he is to discover it's nature: As for instance, if any one holding up a Gilt Shilling, or a Counterfeit Guiney; should be about to inform us truly, that *this* was but a Shilling, or a Counterfeit piece of Gold, which notwithstanding appeared to the Senses like Gold, we should rashly conclude, before he tells us fully, what it is he shews us, that it is a true piece of Gold: Or on the other hand, if any one should hold up a true piece of Gold, which is discoloured so by Sulphur, that it looks but like Silver, and should be informing us, that *this* is a piece of true Gold, we should, before he hath spoke his words, conclude it was but Silver: So it would have been prejudice in our Lord's Disciples, to have concluded of the determinate nature of that, which he held in his Hands, when he was going to tell them, what it really was, *viz.* his Body, before he had fully pronounced the Proposition, saying, *This is my Body*: Which the Sacramentarians and our Author do, rashly determining the thing which appears as Bread, to be so in Substance, upon the exhibiting the Species, and saying, *This*, which notwithstanding, when the Proposition is finished, is in the Sacrament made and declared to be the Body of Christ: *This* therefore being a Pronoun demonstrative, it is enough, that it exhibits something unto us, under a certain outward appearance, without signifying distinctly and clearly the whole nature of the thing, for it is the property of the Attribute or thing, that is affirmed of another, to add clearness to the subject, or thing of which it is affirmed, by explaining the nature of the thing, intended to be demonstrated in the Proposition, more fully; otherwise the Proposition would be ridiculous; as if one should say, this Bread is Bread, or this my Body is my Body. *This* therefore in the Proposition, *This is my Body*, only discovers some Real Thing which appears in such a manner; as for instance, the Species of Bread, to the Senses, which

Transubstantiation Defended.

our Saviour, who was Truth it self, who did know the truth of all things, and could alter the nature of any Created thing, by his Word, declares fully unto them to be his Body, tho' under such an appearance; so that, whether the change was made before, or at that very instant of time, when our Lord spake the words, the latter of which is the general opinion of Catholics; the Proposition is strictly true in a proper Sense.

In what Sense
Catholics allow a
Figure in the
Sacrament.

I shall only premise one thing more, before I examine the Authors pretended proofs from Scripture, because I would by no means make the breach betwixt us wider than it is, which is this, That Catholics acknowledge a Figure in the Sacrament, no less than Protestants. Thus the Bread and Wine, before Consecration being distinct things, and separate one from the other, do resemble Christs Body and Blood separated upon the Cross, and his Soul separated from his Body, altho' they could not do this in their own nature; and till, after the first Institution, they were exposed upon the Altar for such a use, as might make us consider them as such resemblances, since there is not so much of natural likeness, as to call the Idea of the Passion into our mind. We believe also, that after Consecration, Christs Body in the Sacrament under the Veils of the Species of Bread and Wine, is a Figure, Similitude, or Exemplar of the same Body of Christ, as it suffer'd upon the Cross, in like manner as his Body when newly born, was a Resemblance, and Exemplar, and express Image of his Body at full growth: But this we conclude, not from those words of our Lord, *This is my Body*, which must still be understood in a proper Sense; but from the nature of the thing it self, after the Institution known to be made. From whence we firmly believe the Body of Christ to be there; it being of the nature of a Sacrament to represent and exhibit somthing more unto us, than what it outwardly appears to be.

I now proceed to consider the Expressions which the Author produceth out of Scripture, by which he would prove.

a Figurative Presence of Christ's Body, in opposition to a Real one in the Catholic Sense. And this being the main Proof upon which those, who have renounced the Authority of the Church do pretend to build their Faith, since they allow that nothing ought to be admitted as an Article of Faith which is not clearly deduced from hence ; and consequently nothing ought to be condemned as *contrary* to the Christian Faith, but what is manifestly repugnant to this. From hence then it is, that he should bring an evidence, which is able to overthrow the Authority of so many Councils, and several of them General ones, as have determined this Point against him, and to shew plainly that the whole true visible Church of Christ, which hath for near MDCC years received the Doctrin of the Real Presence of Christ's Body, hath erred in so necessary a Point of Faith, and been guilty of Idolatry, even grosser than that of the Heathen World, as the Author pretends ; notwithstanding the Evidence of the same Holy Scripture, that the Holy Spirit shall lead it into all Truth, and that the Gates of Hell shall not be able to prevail against it. Let us see therefore how well he acquits himself in this vast enterprise, of so great concern to the Christian World. His Argument from Scripture is this ; there are other *expressions in Scripture* which are taken figuratively, therefore this must be so taken. Out of the *innumerable like expressions in Holy Scripture*, as he is pleased to term them, he citeth two very different sorts : The first are barely figurative, such as are used in ordinary human discourse as well as Scripture, without preparing of the mind of the Hearer beforehand, that he may receive them. Then he compares the words of our Lord's Institution to *a Dream or Vision of the Night*, that was to be interpreted, which indeed hath something more of resemblance than the former expressions which he alledgeth ; because it being known that the things which are represented in Dreams and Visions are not real but imaginary ; yet since they are sometimes considered as representing real things, that are to come to pass, they are of the nature of Signs of Institution, and so may come nearer to the Case

Transubstantiation Defended.

in hand. But he seems to be soon weary of these resemblances, which being so different in nature, one from the other, are not like to agree to the same third thing, the *Sacrament*. Then he flies from Scripture to *Justin Martyr's* Testimony concerning the ancient *form* of the Passover used by the *Jews*. Yet he knows not whether he should stick to this expression, which is *Sacrificial* or *Sacramental*, and so most likely to resemble the *Sacramental*, about which he argues; or the former, which are not so. For he begins his Periods thus: *Whether we consider the like expressions in Scripture, as where our Saviour saith, &c. or, whether we compare these words with the ancient form of the Passover:* And I am sure these are not of a like nature with the other. Surely there is no *Man of common Sense* that can admit of such a sort of Proof as this, from one Author that so fluctuates in his judgment, since it hath the visible Character of *Falshood* in its very Front, and condemns the *Real Presence* of *Christ's Body*, in a proper Sense, which was never openly contested in *Christ's Church* till *Berengarius's* time, (nor so much as privately, till the time of *Pascasius*, unless by those that denied the *Incarnation* of our Lord it self) as well as the more explicit Sense, *Transubstantiation*, against the Authority of all the Doctors of the *Catholic Church* and its constant Tradition for so many Ages. But lest any one should be deceived with such a pretended *Evidence* from Scripture; I shall shew plainly that never a one of these sorts of expressions, suits with this of our *Saviours* in *Scripture*, and that therefore most certainly all of them do not.

The first, that are mentioned, are barely figurative expressions; as where our *Saviour* saith, *I am the Door, and the true Vine* (and the *Church of Rome* may triumph in this, that our *Lord* saith, that *his Flesh is truly Meat* ἀληθῶς ζέωσις, *Job. 6. 55.*) *the Church is said to be Christ's Body*, and *Christ* is termed a *Rock* in a *Spiritual Sense*, *1 Cor. 10. 4.* *They drank of that Spiritual Rock which followed them*, and *that* which before is called a *Spiritual Rock*, without doubt was *Christ*. Though the *Author* is pleas'd to leave out the

Transubstantiation Defended.

31

the word *Spiritual*, but I would advise him to have a care of that Curse which justly falls upon those that diminish from Holy Scripture, to favour a Party. That I may the better demonstrate the dissimilitude of these, and the other figurative expressions, which are by the Author alledged out of Holy Scripture, to that proper one of our Lord, *This is my Body*; I shall lay down these Rules to distinguish them by.

1. The desire which Men have to make themselves to be understood, and to imprint lively Ideas of that which they conceive themselves, in the minds of others, and of retaining them the better, doth naturally incline them to search for Comparisons and Resemblances, which may render the Idea that they would form, the more sensible. The reason of which is, because things of Sense do most affect the mind, and make the deepest and most lasting impressions; and this Rule is the ground of most metaphorical expressions, which are of so great use and ornament in human discourse.

2. Hence it follows, that the qualities of the thing, which we affirm of another in this figurative way, should be more plain and familiar to us, or at least fully as plain as the thing of which we affirm it, otherwise it will not be fit to work the effect before mentioned.

3. The resemblance lies usually in but one, or but some few, at the most, of those qualities, wherein the thing that is affirmed is like to that thing whereof it is affirmed.

4. The inclination which Men naturally have to abridge their discourse, joined with the desire of imprinting things in the mind, by sensible Ideas, is the cause they ordinarily include these comparisons in the same words that the things they are compar'd to are express by, suppressing all the terms of relation, and expressing them, as if the things of which they speak, were really those things which they use as Images to express them the more clearly by: Thus we find it said, Gen. 49. 9. *Judah is a Lions Whelp.* v. 22. *Joseph is a fruitful Bough.* Hos. 10. 1. *Israel is an empty Vine.*

5. The thing from which the resemblance is taken is generally

Rules to judge of
Metaphorical
expressions by.

Transubstantiation Defended.

generally more ignoble, and of an inferior order to that of which it is affirmed, as being more sensible ; for the objects of Sense are inferior to those of pure Understanding ; and heavenly things are of that exalted nature, that they cannot be compared to any thing that is above them.

6. Therefore the terms are not convertible (for altho' we call a Man of courage a Lion, by reason of the resemblance of the quality of boldnes, yet we term not a Lion a Man.) And the reason of this is, because in the Subject is understood the whole Idea of the thing expressed ; but in the Predicate but some qualities.

7. Altho' for the explaining a barely metaphorical expression, a Parable or a Dream, that which is properly the Predicate be put in the place of the Subject, yet it is rarely so used but upon such like occasions as this; and then too it doth not lose its nature, but is the Predicate still ; for we are not to mind the position of the words to find out the Predicate, but the sense of the Proposition : As in that Proposition of our Lord, *Job. 6. 33. The Bread of God is he which cometh down from Heaven*, he which cometh down from Heaven, is the Subject, altho' put in the place of the Predicate, as is plain : So that, here the thing which is signified or resembled, is always the Subject, and the thing signifying or resembling the Predicate.

8. In Metaphors you cannot punctually design the thing to which another is resembled by pointing to it, or, using a pronoun Demonstrative ; as for instance, tho' Christ in Scripture be called a Way, and a Shepherd, yet you cannot say, Christ is *this* Way, pointing to some particular Way, nor Christ is *this* Shepherd, demonstrating some particular Man that is a Shepherd; nor on the other hand that *this* Way is Christ, *this* Shepherd is Christ.

9. None ever can pretend, that after a mere Metaphorical Allusion in way of Doctrin, a real Vertue should be imparted by receiving that thing to which another is compared : As when Christ calls himself a *Vine* in Scripture, that the eating of the fruit of the Vine should have conveyed Christs Blessing and Vertue.

It will be easie to discern the great disparity between the expression of our Lord, *This is my Body*, and those Metaphorical ones which the Author here alledgedeth, by comparing them together, and examining them by the foregoing Rules. Our Saviour calleth himself a *Door*, because of the natural resemblance, which the Mind, casting about for the meaning of this expression, immediately, without any difficulty finds, and he himself declares ; for as by a *Door* we enter into the House, so by Christ we enter into Heaven ; for through him the way is opened : *A Vine*, in like manner, because from him all true Believers as Branches receive their nourishment and growth in Grace, by which they are enabled to bear Fruit : *A Rock*, because from him the Fountain of Living Waters doth Spring : The Church his *Body*, because of the Union of the Members of his Body one with another, and of all with the Head, and the mutual assistance which they afford each to other, in which the Spiritual Body Resembles a Natural Body.

(a) By these sensible and easie comparissons the Idea of the thing which our Saviour expreſſes, by them, is more lively imprinted in our Minds, and by this means the Memory the better retains them : (b) These do explain the things of which they are affirmed, and render them the more familiar to us ; (c) and yet the Resemblance lies in but one, or, at the most but some few of the qualities ; (d) the terms of relation are suppressed in the first proposal of these expreſſions, altho' explained afterwards, and one word includes the Comparison. It is otherwife in the expression of our Lord, *This is my Body*, supposing that by the Term, *This*, Bread is meant in the Sacramentalian Sense ; (1) for the *Body* of Christ is not a fit thing to Resemble *Bread* by, the notion of *Bread* is not the more sensibly imprinted, by comparing *Christs Body* with it, neither doth the Memory by this means the better retain it ; the applying the Idea of *Christs Body* (2) to *Bread* doth not render the nature of *Bread* more familiar, but on the contrary more abſtruse and difficult to apprehend, (3) the Resemblance lies in none of the visible qualities, (4) the Terms of Relation

The Application of the foregoing Rules: By which it appears, that those merely Metaphorical expressions of our Saviours being a *Door*, a *Vine*, &c. are not at all like to the Form of Consecration, *This is my Body*.

Contrary to R. 1.

R. 2.

R. 3.

R. 4.

Transubstantiation Defended.

lation are not suppressed, for no such Relation can be

(e) See Rules 5,6: conceived. Now to proceed ; (e) In the former expressions, the things which are expressed, are of an Inferior nature to the things of which they are expressed, yet more sensible ; therefore the Terms are not convertible :

(f) See Rules 7,8. (f) For altho' it be said *Christ is the Door*, yet we cannot say of any particular *Door*, that it is *Christ* ; altho' it is affirmed that *Christ is the true Vine*, yet we cannot say of any *Vine* pointing to it, that it is *Christ* ; altho' he be called a *Rock*, yet we cannot say, designing some particular *Rock*, that *this Rock is Christ* : For in that Proposition, *the Rock was Christ*, we must not regard the order of the words, but the Sense of the Proposition to find out the Subject and the Predicate ; so that when it was said, *the Rock was Christ*, the meaning is, *Christ was Typified by that Rock*, or *Christ was like that Rock*, unless we understand, as we ought to do from the preceding words of the Apostle, by the Term *Rock*, a *Spiritual Rock*, and so he was really such a *Rock*, and not Typically so ; Altho' it be said, that *the Church is the Body of Christ*, yet we cannot affirm of the natural

(g) Contrary to (g) otherwise R. 5,6,7,8. in the expression of our Lord : For the Predicate is here

of the same nature with the Subject, if understood in the Sense of Catholics ; it is of a Superior nature, if understood in the Sense of our Adversaries ; the Terms, if taken in the former Sense are convertible ; for as it was said by Christ, *This is my Body*, meaning the thing that was contained under the visible Species, so it might be affirmed of the same Body, that it was, *this* ; which was thus contained : In the latter Sense we may as well affirm, that the *Body of Christ was Bread*, as that *Bread was the Body of Christ*, for indeed neither of these could be truly affirmed, since these Propositions, in this Sense, would be false, and absurd, there being no sensible Resemblance, nor no identity, for the Terms are incompatible : And therefore we need not consider of the Sense of them, to find out which is the Subject, and which the Predicate, for there is no true Sense here to be found, nor no such relation, because

our Lord had not declared the *Bread* to be a sign of Institution, before he spoke these words, *This is my Body*, and the *Bread* was not naturally a sign of his *Body*; as shall be shewed in the ensuing Discourse.

Well, but tho' the Proposition seem so very absurd in this Sense, where the *Body of Christ* is taken for the Predicate, or thing by which Bread is resembled; yet if *This*, that is, the *Bread* shew'd in *Christ's* Hands, according to our Adversaries, be taken for the Predicate, meaning by the Proposition, *This is my Body*, that This *Bread* is a Resemblance of *my Body*, they will say perhaps it is not so: But I shall prove it to be so, for these Reasons.

1. Because if the words were to be so understood, then if the See Rule 7. Predicate were restored to its proper place, the Sense would be clear and obvious, as in that Proposition of our Lord; Joh. 6. 33. *The Bread of God is he which cometh down from Heaven*; when we change the position of the words, and say, *He which cometh down from Heaven is the Bread of God*; for now the Subject and Predicate have their proper places; But it is otherwise in this Proposition, *This is my Body*, meaning by, *This*, the *Bread* then Demonstrated; for you cannot say, without absurdity, that the *Body of Christ* is this *Bread*, meaning some particular *Bread*. 2. In Metaphorical expressions the Predicate is not put in the place of the Subject at the first proposal of the Similitude, Parable, or the like; but afterwards when the Explanation is made, according to the Sixth and Seventh Rules before mentioned. Thus it was said by our Lord, Matt. 13. 24. *The Kingdom of Heaven*, (That is, Christ the Son of Man setting forth, and obtaining this Kingdom for us) *is likened to a Man that Sowed good Seed in his Field*; before he would say by way of Explication, Ver. 37. *He that Sowed the good Seed is the Son of Man*, and when he had proposed the rest of the Parable unto them; then, by way of Explication, it also follows; *The Field is the World: The good Seed are the Children of the Kingdom, but the Tares are the Children of the wicked one*: Which method is also used in the other

Transubstantiation Defended.

See Rule 8.

Parables of Scripture, that are Explained. 3. The Pre-dicate or thing Resembling in these Metaphors, whether it be put in the place of the Subject, or in it's own, is never particularised by a Pronoun Demonstrative: For our Lord doth not say, Pointing to any *Husband-man*, *This is the Son of Man*; or of a *Field* that he was in, *This is the World*; or of any good *Grains of Corn*, that he sees Sown, *These are the Children of the Kingdom*: So likewise it would have been improper to have said, *This my Body is Bread*; or *This Bread is my Body*.

Lastly, Those of the English Church do pretend from these words of Christ, *This is my Body*, that there is some Spiritual Blessing or Virtue of *Christs Body* (tho' the *Body* it self be not there) annexed to the Elements, or their Reception, which, if they were but a mere Metaphorical expression, like the rest mentioned by the Author, it is highly unreasonable to conclude. Therefore for this reason, as also for all the disparities before shewed, we may truly affirm, that there is no such Resemblance, as the Author pretends, between the foregoing expressions alledged out of Scripture, where our Saviour is call'd a *Vine*, a *Door*, &c. And that of our Lord's Institution, *This is my Body*. I shall now proceed to examin the next that are Cited, which are of a very different nature from the former.

As when *Joseph* Expounding *Pharaohs Dream* to him, Gen. 41. 26. Says, *the Seven good Kine are Seven Years, and the Seven good Ears of Corn, are Seven Years*: Which expressions, as also that out of *Justin Martyr* that follows, the Author compares to the words of *Christs Institution*. Now, that I may shew, that there is no reason that our Lords words should be taken in the Figurative Sense of these expressions, but contrarywise in a proper Sense, I shall lay down these distinctions and Rules to shew the disparity by.

Signs are either Naturally so, as black Clouds are a Sign of Rain, Smoak is a Sign of Fire; or else so, only by Institution and agreement; concerning which latter, I again.

Pharaohs Dream
doth not resemble the Sacred
words of Consecration, *This is
my Body*.

Distinctions and
Rules for the
following Dis-
course of the
nature of signs.

gain distinguish. That of Signs of Institution, some have so much of Natural Resemblance, as that they may fitly be chosen to signify and represent, altho' not enough to exhibit the Idea of the thing upon the bare sight or mentioning, which afterwards by Institution they are to signify unto us (Thus a living Creature Sacrificed Typifies, or signifies Christ Crucified upon the Cross;) and some have not; Thus the word *Moses* doth signify such a Man; where there is no Natural Resemblance between these Letters compounded into a word, and the person Represented by them, but this depends upon mere Institution and compact amongst Men.

2. All rational Discourse used amongst Men is founded upon the imperfect penetration, at least, into the Minds of those with whom we discourse, and the presumed Knowledge of them. For we regulate our Speech, according to the apprehension that we believe those, with whom we converse, have of it. If we believe Mens Minds to be prepared to understand our Discourse, then we utter it to them; if they are not able as yet to perceive what we say, then we must either prepare them beforehand, or else give a distinct and formal explication of our words, soon after we have uttered them, otherwise we abuse our Auditors. From whence it follows,

3. That that sort of improper Discourse, wherein we give the Sign the name of the thing signified, or to the thing signified the name of the Sign, being very rare, to make it intelligible, it is required, 1. That the Sign be plainly Instituted. 2. It must be justly presumed, that those to whom we speak, regard the thing as a Sign, or else we ought to advertise them, that we intend to use it as so. For there is no example either in Scripture or ordinary human Discourse of a like expression to this of our *Lords*, by which, at the very first constituting any thing into a Sign, it is called the thing signified, without preparing the minds of the Auditors to understand it so. To apply these Rules to the case in hand, we must observe, that this Dream or Vision of *Pharaohs* was a Sign of Institution,

Application of
the foregoing
Rules and
Distinctions.

it

Transubstantiation Defended.

it having been appointed by God to signify something to him: Again, indeed this Sign had some sort of fitness, in it's own nature, to be made a Sign of what it was to represent, even more than *Bread* hath to represent *Christs Body*, yet it could not exhibit to *Pharaohs* Mind the thing which it was to signify without some explicit interpretation of good Authority, and it was so obscure a Sign, that none of all his Magicians could give it. Therefore *Pharaoh* proposes this to *Joseph* as a *Dream*, Gen. 41. v. 22. Advertising him of what he saw in a *Dream*; which *Joseph* undertaking to Interpret, *Pharaoh* could not but consider his words as an Interpretation of this Sign of Institution; therefore by the Second, and Third Rules, beforementioned, it was very rational for him to put the Predicate in the place of the Subject, the Sign for the thing signified, by saying, *the Seven good Kine are Seven Years, and the Seven good Ears of Corn are Seven Years, that is, they signified or represented Seven Years of Plenty*; since it is very well known that in the Hebrew Language things are commonly said to be that which they do signify and represent: But then it must be known beforehand, that they do only signify and represent; otherwise it cannot be understood when they only express a Resemblance, and when Identity. On the contrary, if in the expression of our Lord, *This is my Body*, the *Bread* had been a Sign of Institution, tho' it have some remote resemblance, yet since it could not of it self, before plain positive Institution, bring the Idea of the thing, supposed to be represented, to the Mind, therefore since there was no such foregoing Institution, or action to prepare the Minds of the Apostles to consider it as so, and these words of Christ are no explication of a Sign of Institution, but must be the Original Institution it self of a Sign, if any had been here made, and the Apostles were no ways advertised before-hand to consider the Bread as a Sign; since the Predicate therefore could not rightly here be put in the place of the Subject, much less a Pronoun Demonstrative be used according to a former Rule; therefore these words, *This is my Body*, according

ding to the known Rules of human Discourse, which it were Blasphemy to say our *Lord* would swerve from, so as to speak absurdly, do signify that, That was his *Real Body* which he held in his hands, and not a *Sign* only of his *Body*, as our Adversaries fallly pretend. *Neither do I believe, that any sensible man, who had never heard before of this figurative Sense, which the Author and Sacramentarians have so often inculcated into their Followers, as to make them prejudiced in the Case, would upon reading the Institution of the Sacrament in the Gospel, or if they had heard Christ speak the words, ever have imagined that by these words, This is my *Body*, no more was to be understood, than that, this, which Christ held in his hands was only a *Sign* of his *Body*, any more than our Saviours Apostles and Disciples could be made to understand the like words, John 6. 51, 52. I am the living *Bread* that came down from Heaven. And the *Bread* that I will give is my *Flesh*, which I will give for the life of the world (the Jews therefore strove amongst themselves saying, how can this *Man* give us his *Flesh* to eat?) in that Sense: But would have understood his meaning to have been thus: This which hath the outward appearance of *Bread* is really my *Body*, This which hath the resemblance of *Wine* is my *Blood*. Not as the Author fallaciously propo-
seth the meaning, This *Bread* signifies my *Body*, this *Cup* signifies my *Blood*, But that he should enjoyn them to do that which they then saw him do, That is, offer up, hereafter, his *Real Body* and *Blood*, under the Species of *Bread* and *Wine*, by way of an unbloody *Sacrifice*, for a Memorial of that Bloody one of his *Body* and *Blood*, which he was soon after to offer up upon the *Cross*. And in this great Mystery, a true Christian, one that hath an humble Soul rightly disposed for the Belief of our *Lords* words, as St.*

Augustin had, who speaking of our *Lord*, saith: *Christ* Ferebatur *Christus* in manibus suis, quando commen-
was carried in his own hands, when recommending to them his
very *Body*, he saith, This is my *Body*. For he carried that
Body in his hands; such a one I say, can readily believe
that our *Saviour* did properly, and really hold himself in
his hand, and give away himself, but not from himself with
Ferebatur *Christus* in manibus suis, quando commen-
dans ipsum corpus suum, ait, hoc est
corpus meum. Fer-
ebatur enim illud corpus in manibus suis. Aug. Com-
ment. in Ps. 33.

Transubstantiation Defended.

his own hands; by reason of the natural Connection and Concomitance which his Sacred Soul and Divinity have with his *Body and Blood*, under the visible Species of *Bread and Wine*.

DISCOURSE.

Or whether we compare these words of our Saviour with the ancient Form of the Passover used by the Jews from Ezra's time, as (n) Justin Martyr tells us, τὸν τὸ μίχα ὁ οὐρανὸς ἡμῶν καταρρέειν ἡμῶν, this Passover is our Saviour and our refuge: Not that they believed the Paschal Lamb to be substantially changed either into God their Saviour who delivered them out of the Land of Egypt, or into the Messias the Saviour whom they expected and who was signified by it: But this Lamb which they did eat, did represent to them and put them in mind of that Salvation which God wrought for their Fathers in Egypt, when by the slaying of a Lamb and sprinkling the Blood of it upon their Doors their first-born were passed over and spared; and did likewise foreshew the Salvation of the Messias, the Lamb of God that was to take away the Sins of the World.

ANSWER.

The Analogy which the words of Instituton, *This is my Body, might have to the Paschal form in Scripture, or to those phraes cited from Esdras, or any of the Rabins, do not prove that Christ's words here, are to be taken figuratively and not in a proper Sense.*

The Author having tried several very different sorts of expressions in Holy Scripture, with which he hath offer'd to compare the words of our Lord's Institution, seeming not at all to be satisfied in his Mind, about their Analogy to these, yet not able to discover any of a nearer resemblance, being at a great loss, hath recourse to the Authority of an Ancient Father, and now he will either find one or make one, if he can, for his purpose. For considering that our Saviour had just before this Institution celebrated the Passover, it might seem reasonable to conclude, that he should now imitate that manner of speaking which he used so very lately. Therefore it is but finding, or coyning a Paschal Form of Institution, suitable to the saying

saying of our Lord, *This is my Body*, and he may think his work is done. What pity it is, that he could not discover one in all the Scripture or Fathers for his purpose, but that he must be forc't to use such pitiful Sophistry as he here doth to impose upon his Reader in this manner? *Whether*, saith he, *we compare these words of our Saviour with the ancient Form of the Passover used by the Jews from Ezra's time*, as Justin Martyr tells us; But where doth he tell us so? There's not a word said, by him, that, that which is cited here, was an Ancient Form of the Passover, or that it was used by the Jews from *Ezra's time*; this is a pure *Invention* of the Authors, which you will be fully convinced of, by consulting *Justin Martyr* himself, about the words, which were by the Jews left out of those Interpretations of *Ezra's*, or *Esdras's*, wherein he expounds the Law of the Passover, and which run thus: * *Esdras said to the People, This Passover, -* * Τέτο τὸ Πάσχα-
Sacrifice is our Saviour and our Refuge, but if you think, and χαράσσετε
it enter into your Heart to conceive, that we render him abject ήμῶν καὶ κατ-
in a Sign, and afterwards place our hope in him, let not this ταφούγιον ήμῶν,
place be forsaken for ever, saith the Lord of Hosts, and if καὶ εἰσὶν διαφορ-
you do not believe his words, nor hearken to his Preaching, οὐ μῶν ἐστὶ τὴν
you will be had in derision by all Nations. This is all that *καρδίαν, ὅπερ*
the Father faith of the matter, where we find not one μέλλομεν
word said, of what the Author cites, as being *an Ancient* αὐτὸν ταπει-
Form of the Passover used by the Jews, but only that, in νεῖστι σημεῖον,
these words, Esdras expounded the Law of the Passover χαράσσετε τὰν
to the People; neither is here the least mention made of ἐπιστολὴν εἰς
it's being used by the Jews from Esdras's time, all this is μὴ ἐγημαθῇ ὁ
the mere Fiction of our Author, who did not consider, τόπος ἐπιστολῆς
that, Holy Scripture, and Learned Authors amongst his χρόνον, λέγετε
own party, give us an account of the Paschal Forms that ὁ θεὸς τῶν
were used, which are quite different from this, which no δημάσεων εἰσὶν
Author gives us as one but himself. For *Exod. 12. 11.* δε μὴ τις εἰσώσῃ
God faith, *It is the Lord's Passover*, or more explicitly, περιεῖσθαι μηδὲ
Ver. 26. 27. It shall come to pass, when your Children shall κηρύγματος
say unto you, what mean you by this service? That ye shall αὐτοῖς, ἔτεσθε
say, it is the Sacrifice of the Lord's Passover. And *Ver. 13.* ἐπίχειρα
It τοῖς ἐδρεσιν.

Transubstantiation Defended.

It is said, *the Blood shall be to you for a Token, or Sign, and when I see the Blood I will pass over you.* And Dr. **Hammond** tells us that the Lamb drest in the Paschal Supper, and set upon the Table, was called, *The Body of the Passover, or the Body of the Paschal Lamb*, (not the Body of Christ, of which, notwithstanding, it was a Sign and Type) another Paschal Form he tells us, was: *This is the Bread of Affliction*, referring to the unleavened Bread:

Which Forms are nothing like this Expository Phrase of *Esdras* cited by *Justin Martyr*. Well, but altho' this be not a *Paschal Form*, yet it is a certain expression which *Esdras* used concerning the Passover, and I shall now shew so great a disparity between it, as so considered, and that of our Lords Institution, as will plainly discover how falsely it is urged here to prove, that our Lords words are Metaphorical. For, 1. These words were true in a proper Sense, which our Adversaries will not allow Christ to be: *The, Passover was a Saviour or Salvation* (*σωτήρ* for *σωτηρία* a way of speaking used by other Authors and explained in the following word) *and a Refuge to the Jews, in a strict Sense, God having appointed it as a means and Instrumental cause at least of their deliverance, at its first Institution, and it was a Salvation and Refuge to those who afterwards used it aright.* Why then may we not likewise conclude from hence, that, that which Christ gave to his Disciples, when he said, *This is my Body*, was really his *Body*? 2. All the Jews, who had a right understanding of things, considered the *Sacrifices*, that were offered as *Types* of Christ the Messias, and this of the Passover more signally as so, as appears from this Authority of *Esdras* out of *Justin Martyr*, in these words, *If you think that we render him absurd in this Sign, and afterwards place our hope in him; Therefore it was not at all unreasonable to Attribute the thing signified to that which they regarded in their minds as a Sign, by saying, This Passover Sacrifice is our Saviour and our Refuge: Not that they could have any ground from hence to believe the Paschal Lamb to be substantially changed, either into*

God

Transubstantiation Defended.

43

God their Saviour, who delivered them out of the Land of Egypt, or into the Messias the Saviour, whom they expected, and who was signified by it: But this Lamb which they did Eat, being known to be a Sign of Institution, did represent to them, and put them in mind of that Salvation which God wrought for their Fathers in Egypt, when by the slaying of a Lamb, and sprinkling the Blood of it upon their Doors, their first-born were passed over and spared; and did likewise foreshew the Salvation of the Messias, the Lamb of God that was to take away the sins of the World. Now the Bread, and Wine, not having been at all discovered to be such Signs of our Saviours Body and Blood, to the Disciples, nor consequently considered as so, it was against the Rules of human discourse, to say they were his Body and Blood, if no more was meant, than that they were Signs of them; and as absurd, as for Moses before the formal Institution of the Paschal Sacrifice, recited at large in *Exod. 12.* to have said to the People upon Sacrificing a Lamb, *This is the Lords Passover.* Or *This Passover is your Saviour.* For it was to be known and considered as a Passover Sacrifice, and as a Type of the Messias, before he could reasonably have affirmed thus of it. 3. The Jewish Passover was a Type of this Sacrament, and so it is generally acknowledged by the * Fathers to be; now that there should be a Sign of a Sign only, a Type of that, which it self was but a Type, Instituted by Christ, is very unreasonable to imagin; especially since we do not now live under a Law of Shadows and Figures, but of Verity and substance.

Since, therefore, the Paschal Lamb was really, and in a proper Sense the Sacrifice of the Lords Passover according to that true Paschal Form in * Holy Scripture, because a true Paschal Sacrifice was offered by the Jews as well for a grateful acknowledgment of their past benefit, as of one that was certainly to come; since this Passover Sacrifice was really a Saviour, or Salvation to the Jews, as well as a Type of the Messias; since the Lamb drest in the Paschal Supper, was not only call'd, but really was, the Body of

* See in their Authorities, infra.

* *Exod. 12. 17.*

Transubstantiation Defended.

the *Passover Sacrifice*, or *Paschal Lamb*, according to the foremention'd expresssions of *Esdras*, and the Rabins, which, notwithstanding we can by no means allow to be Paschal Forms of constant usage, since they so vary from one another ; much less of Divine Institution, because no such are used in Holy Scripture ; since the Bread which the Jews Eat, when they used that Phrase, *This is the Bread of Affliction*, was Real Bread ; and all that Eat this Bread, as they ought to do, were really afflicted, when they seriously consider'd what their * Fathers suffer'd in *Egypt* ; because they also, for their own sins, deserv'd to suffer as much, this Bread also being the same *which* their Fathers did Eat, viz. unleavened Bread : Surely none can be so hard of belief, as to imagin, after serious consideration, that there was less of truth and reality in our Lords words, *This is my Body*, in which, as is not improbable, he might imitate some of these Phrases, than there was even in these expressions which were used under the Law, of Types and Shadows. And to shew the Analogy the more perfectly, and not to represent it partially, as our * Adversaries do, we are further to consider, That as the Bread of Affliction, which was yearly Eaten by the Jews at the time of the Paschal Solemnity, was really Bread, and of the same kind with that which their Fathers did Eat in *Egypt* ; and was also a *Memorial* of the first Bread of this kind, which their Fathers did Eat ; As the Paschal Lamb that was yearly drest, and really Eaten, was the Real Body of the Passover Sacrifice thus yearly offer'd, and was also to put the Jews in mind of the first deliverance wrought upon the first Paschal Offering ; so Christians, when they renew the Sacrifice of Eucharist, feed upon Christs Real Body, which is the Antitype of the Paschal Lamb, and at the same time

* Remember that first Oblation which Christ made of the same Body, altho' in a different manner upon the Cross.

* *Vid. A Discourse of the Holy Eucharist. Edit. A. 1687. p. 12.*

* *Vid. Exposition of the words, Do this in remembrance of me, infra.*

DISCOURSE.

And nothing is more common in all Languages than to give the name of the thing signified to the Sign. As the delivery of a Deed or Writing under hand and Seal is call'd a conveyance or making over of such an Estate, and it is really so; not the delivery of mere Wax and Parchment, but the conveyance of a Real Estate; as truly and really to all effects and purposes of Law, as if the very material Houses and Lands themselves could be and were actually delivered into my Hands: In like manner the names of the things themselves made over to us in the new Covenant of the Gospel between God and Man, are given to the Signs and Seals of that Covenant. By Baptism Christians are said to be made partakers of the Holy Ghost, Heb. 6. 4. And by the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper we are said to Communicate or to be made partakers of the Body of Christ which was broken, and of his Blood which was shed for us, that is, of the real benefits of his Death and Passion. And thus St. Paul speaks of this Sacrament, 1 Cor. 10. 16. The Cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ? But still it is Bread, and he still calls it so, v. 17. For we being many are one Bread and one Body; for we are partakers of that one Bread. The Church of Rome might, if they pleased, as well argue from hence, that all Christians are substantially changed, first into Bread, and then into the natural Body of Christ by their participation of the Sacrament, because they are said thereby to be one Bread and one Body. And the same Apostle in the next Chapter, after he had spoken of the Consecration of the Elements, still calls them the Bread and the Cup, in three verses together, As often as ye Eat this Bread, and Drink this Cup, v. 26. Whosoever shall Eat this Bread, and Drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily, v. 27. But let a Man examine himself, and so let him Eat of this Bread and Drink of that Cup, v. 28. And our Saviour himself when he had said, this

Transubstantiation Defended.

• Mat. 26. 29.

this is my Blood of the New Testament, immediately adds, * but I say unto you, I will not henceforth Drink of this fruit of the Vine, until I Drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom, that is, not till after his Resurrection, which was the first step of his Exaltation into the Kingdom, given him by his Father, when the Scripture tells us he did Eat and Drink with his Disciples. But that which I observe from our Saviour's words is, that after the Consecration of the Cup and the delivering of it to his Disciples to Drink of it, he tells them that he would thenceforth Drink no more of the fruit of the Vine, which he had now Drank with them, till after his Resurrection. From whence it is plain that it was the fruit of the Vine, Real Wine, which our Saviour Drank of and Communicated to his Disciples in the Sacrament.

A N S W E R.

A Deed's being
call'd a convey-
ance doth not
prove that the
words *This is my*
Body, are not to
be taken pro-
perly.

Here, since neither the Authority of the Fathers, nor the Word of God can afford the Authors cause any relief, he at length flies to the Laws of Men, for it, where we shall see him immediately cast himself, and be non-suited at the very beginning of his Trial. He tells us, that the delivery of a Deed or Writing under Hand and Seal is called a Conveyance or making over of such an Estate, (that is, of a Title to such an Estate) and that it really is so; that we deny, unless there be possession also given, as I shall presently shew. And yet what do we affirm more of Christs words in the Sacrament, *This is my Body which is given for you, &c.* which we have, taken from his own mouth by the Hands of inspired Pen-men, Sealed by himself with Miracles, and delivered to his Church, than that they are a Conveyance, or making over of his Sacred Body to us, and that they are so really, not only in Sign or Figure? He proceeds to tell us, That this Delivery of a Deed or Writing under Hand and Seal, is not the Delivery of mere Wax, and Parchment, but the conveyance of a Real Estate, as truly and really to all effects and purposes of Law, as if the material Houses and Lands themselves could be, and

Transubstantiation Defended.

47

and were actually delivered into my hands. Well, but we say that a *Deed of Feoffment* takes not effect to *all purposes of Law*, without *Livery and Seisin*, neither doth it convey an *Estate* without that, nor a *Deed of Release* neither, unless the *Purchaser* be put in *Possession*, before hand, by a *Lease*, and then too, not by the *Common Law*; but so necessary is *Possession* deemed for the through *Conveyance* of an *Estate*, that in case of absence from the *Land* or the like, the *Law-makers* have by a particular *Statute* necessarily provided to give *Possession* otherwise, for it is not necessary to the making a *Man* in *Possession* of an *Estate*, that he should hold his *Land* and *House* in his *Arms*, or stand always upon the *Premises*. But I hope the *Author* will not so far endeavor to invalidate the *Common Assurance of the Nation*, as to maintain, that because the *Man* hath *thus a Conveyance of a real Estate to all effects, and purposes of Law*, therefore he must not enter upon it, dwell in the *House*, Reap the *Fruits* of the *ground*, and nourish himself therewith, I imagin the *Purchaser* will not be put off so. In like manner, the words of *Christ* delivered, as his *Act and Deed*, by the *Priest* his *Substitute*, in the *Consecration* of the *Sacrament* for the use of those that are to *Communicate*, is not the *bare delivery* of so many *Words* only, but the *making over of a real Title* to them, to the thing which is meant by them, that is, the *Body* of our *Lord*, *as truly and really to all effects, and purposes* of the *Gospel*, as if it actually hung upon the *Cross* before their *Eyes*, in that *Form*, and with the same *configuration*, and *quality* of *parts* as it once did. Shall they therefore be hindred from taking immediate *Possession* of what is thus made over to them? No, this were too great a *Sacrilege* against *God*, and violation of the *property* of a *Christian*. They shall receive *Christs Body and Blood*, that they may dwell in him and he in them. They shall partake of the *Fruits* of the *Sacrament*, as of a *goodly Heritage* of their own, since *Christ* hath given them a *just Right and Title* to it, and shall cherish their *Souls* and *Bodies* therewith to *Immortality*. Those who

are

Transubstantiation Defended.

are contented only to hear of, or to see this goodly Land, and not to go and possess it ; Those who will leave their Fathers House the Catholic Church , and go abroad to feed upon Husks, and imaginary vertue, are the objects of our pity. So indeed there is a sort of a Fiction in Law, in the Authors way of conveyance, of a Tenant by Deed or Lease of possession, who notwithstanding hath nothing to do to enter upon the Estate, or enjoy it ; if the Author be contented with such a Title only in the Sacrament, I am sorry for him. And thus the Similitude is reasonably applied , as for our Adversaries way , who faith , that *as the delivery of a Deed or Writing under Hand and Seal is call'd a Conveyance or making over of such an Estate ,* (he should have prov'd that the Deed is called the Estate it self, and not only the Conveyance of an Estate, if he would have made this phrase any thing suitable to that of our Lord, *This is my Body*) *in like manner the names of the things themselves made over to us in the New Covenant of the Gospel between God and Man, are given to the Signs and Seals of the Covenant ;* whereas there is no Analogy between these things, nor truth neither in this instance. It is just as if one should say , that Tenterden Steeple were like the Goodwin Sands. I confess, I have often admired with my self at this sort of Similitude, which Protestants are mighty big with, pretending to Illustrate their fond opinion about the Sacrament clearly hereby, which being examined, provès as you see, but a mere Tympany of the Brain.

Other Texts of
Scripture ex-
amin'd, and
prov'd, not at all
to favor the Au-
thors Sense.

The Author having before told us, that nothing is more Common in all Languages than to give the name of the thing signified to the Sign, proceeds now to give us examples of this out of Holy Scripture ; by Baptism, saith he , *Christians are said to be partakers of the Holy Ghost , Heb. 6. 4.* And so they really are, and their Bodies are his Temples : But since Baptism is the Sign, and the Holy Ghost the thing signified , according to him, why doth he not bring us one instance out of Scripture of Baptisms being called the *Holy Ghost* , as they pretend that *Bread* in

the

the words of Institution is called *Christ's Body*? For this which he hath brought of Baptism is no Example to his *Common Rule*: We may reasonably conclude, that if the Sacrament of Baptism had been so very like this of the Eucharist, as they would have it, it would have been Instituted in a like Form, but it is quite otherwise: For neither Water, nor Baptism it self are called in Holy Scripture the *Holy Ghost*, neither is there any Form of Consecration of the Element, delivered. Indeed, *by the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper we are also said to Communicate, or to be made partakers of the Body of Christ which was broken, and his Blood that was shed for us*; but that is his *Real Body* and *Blood* together with all the *real benefits* of his *Death and Passion*, which do thereby accrue to us. *And thus St. Paul speaks of this Sacrament, 1 Cor. 10. 16. The Cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ?* That is, after Consecration, it *really* is so; altho' the Apostle *calls* it Bread by a Metaphor (that being to our Souls what the ordinary Bread is to our Bodies, true nourishment) so also it is said that *Aarons Rod devour'd the other Rods*, Exod. 7. 12. altho' it was then become a *Serpent*, v. 10. That *Water* which was by our Lord converted into *Wine* is still called *Water*, Joh. 2. 9. The *Angels* are called *Men*, Gen. 19. 8. because they appeared in the shape of Men, according to the usual Language of Sense, very many instances of which are to be found: For our Saviour had fully instructed them before, that *the Bread which he would give them was his flesh*, Joh. 6. 51. The Apostle also faith again, v. 17. *For we being many are one Bread, and one Body; for we are partakers of that one Bread, and that one Bread can signify nothing here but the Body of Christ*, which indeed is but *one*, altho' appearing in *innumerable* places of the World at the same, and at several times, because it is still animated by the same one Soul and Divinity of Christ; which cannot be said of the Bread in the Sacrament, if but *mere Bread*, for then it would

Transubstantiation Defended.

not be one Bread or Loaf, but *many*, and of several sorts, being received at very many places at the same time: And the true reason here, why they are called one Bread and one Body or Society of Christians, is, because they are all partakers of that one Bread, *viz.* the Body of Christ, and therefore also all inspired with the same Spirit. But, in the Authors Sense, it would be no reason, but they should rather have been many Bodies, because they did Eat of so many Breads: So that we see he hath still the same success, in bringing those Texts of Scripture to uphold his cause, which are the most pregnant proofs against him. He then proceeds to teach the Catholics how they might argue in his new way, from a *Sign* already Instituted and known as so, to an *Enigma*, or dark saying, taken from things of a disparate and really different nature, and of no acknowledg'd Resemblance, that is, from Chalk to Cheese; but they beg his Pardon for that. Well, but the same *Apostle*, in the next Chapter, after he had spoken of the Consecration of the Elements, still calls them the Bread and the Cup in three verses together, as often as ye Eat *THIS* Bread, and Drink *THIS* Cup, v. 26. *Whosoever shall Eat THIS Bread and Drink THIS Cup of the Lord unworthily*, v. 27. *But let a Man Examine himself, and so let him Eat of THAT Bread and Drink of THAT Cup*, v. 28. It is true it was Bread Metaphorically, but it was still *this* Bread with an Emphasis, not such Bread as you ordinarily Eat, but the Body of Christ, which he told us was truly Meat, or Meat indeed, the true Bread from Heaven, *John* 6. 32. It was a Cup, but it was *this* Cup, that is, his Blood, which was truly Drink, or Drink indeed, as he also hath taught us, *John* 6. 55. and after examination, let the true Christian Eat of that Bread and Drink of that Cup, which will strengthen his Body and Soul both, much more than the ordinary Bread and Wine can his Body only. *Our Saviour himself, when he had said, This is my Blood of the New Testament, immediately adds, but I say unto you, I will not henceforth Drink of this Fruit of the Vine (that is of the true Vine, as our*

Transubstantiation Defended.

51

our Lord is pleased to call himself,) or of that Wine, which by the Words of Benediction becomes my Blood , being Originally the Fruit of the Vine ; (or possibly it may refer to the unconsecrated Wine that was left in the Vessels) *until I drink it new*, that is fresh and newly Consecrated again *with you in my Fathers Kingdom*, or after my Resurrection, as some, with the Author , interpret the place ; but as others more generally, till I drink of that *new Wine* of another sort and nature, *in the Kingdom of my heavenly Father*, where *we* shall drink of the *River of his pleasures*, *Psal. 36. 8.* and therefore the Authors following observation is nothing worth. For after the Apostles were satisfied that they really drank the *Blood* of our Lord in this Sacrament , and fed upon his *Real Body*, it was an easy and familiar Metaphor to call them Bread and Wine , because the outward Species gave a sufficient hint, for the understanding of this Figurative Speech , suitable to the Language of Sense in the instances above mentioned, out of Scripture ; and because there was true Spiritual nourishment conveyed to the faithful by the *Body* and *Blood* of our Saviour thus received, as there is Corporeal nourishment received by the Natural Bread and Wine, which we take for the refection of our Bodies.

DISCOURSE.

Besides, if we consider that he celebrated this Sacrament before his Passion, it is impossible these words should be understood literally of the natural Body and Blood of Christ; because it was his Body broken and his Blood shed, which he gave to his Disciples, which if we understand literally of his natural Body broken and his blood shed, then these words, this is my Body which is broken, and this is my Blood which is shed, could not be true, because his Body was then whole and unbroken, and his Blood not then shed; nor could it be a propitiatory Sacrifice (as they affirm this Sacrament to be) unless they will say that Propitiation was made before Christ suffered: And it is likewise impossible that the Disciples should understand these words literally, because

Transubstantiation Defended.

cause they not only plainly saw that what he gave them was Bread and Wine, but they saw likewise as plainly that it was not his Body which was given, but his Body which gave that which was given; no his Body broken and this Blood shed, because they saw him alive at that very time and beheld his Body whole and unpierc'd; and therefore they could not understand these words literally: If they did, can we imagine that the Disciples, who upon all other occasions were so full of questions and objections, should make no difficulty of this matter? nor so much as ask our Saviour, how can these things be? that they should not tell him, we see this to be Bread and that to be Wine, and we see thy Body to be distinct from both; we see thy Body not broken, and thy Blood not shed.

From all which it must needs be very evident, to any man that will impartially consider things, how little reason there is to understand those words of our Saviour, this is my Body, and this is my Blood, in the sense of Transubstantiation; nay on the contrary, that there is very great reason and an evident necessity to understand them otherwise. I proceed to shew,

A N S W E R.

Christ's body's being broken, and his blood being poured out for the remission of sins, before he was Crucified, proves the sense of the Reality.

Besides, if we consider that our Lord celebrated this Sacrament before his Passion, it is impossible that these words should be understood otherwise than properly, of the real Body and Blood of Christ; because it was his Body broken, and his Blood poured out, which he gave to his Disciples, which if we understand as figurative only of his natural Body broken, and his Blood shed, then these words, this is my Body which is broken, and this is my Blood which is shed, could not be true, because his natural, organized, and visible Body was then whole and unbroken, and its Blood not then shed; yet that very Body as broken in the Sacrament was said to be * then given for them, that very Blood as there poured out was said then to be poured out for the remission of sins:

* Luke 22. 19, 20. This is my Body, which is given for you, in the present tense. See also the war. s. of Institution as recited by the other two Evangelists, all in the present tense.

Therefore it was a propitiatory Sacrifice, although offered before, as well as after Christ had suffered, to pay the full Price of our Redemption, because its whole nature did consist

consist in the relation which it had to the Sacrifice that was offered up for us upon the Cross, from which it received all its virtue: *It was* very possible therefore for our Lords Disciples to understand these words properly, because although they plainly saw that what he gave them had the Species of Bread and Wine, yet they believed him, when he said that it was his Body that was given for them, although his Body at the same time gave what was given; his Body broken and his Blood poured out for them, although they saw him alive at that very time, and beheld his Body whole and unpierced, because he had plainly told them so, who had the Words of eternal Life, and could not deceive them; and for this reason they could not but understand his words properly: Otherwise, can we imagin that the Disciples, who upon all other occasions were so full of questions and objections, if they could have conceiv'd that these words were to be understood in a parabolical or improper Sense, would not have desired an Explication of them of our Lord, as they did of other Parables, which were more easy to be understood, than these words, in such a Sense? nor so much as ask our Saviour, how can these things be? That they should not tell him, we see This to be Bread, and That to be Wine, and we see thy Body to be distinct from both; we see thy Body not broken, and thy Blood not shed; what therefore should be the meaning of these words? or that our Saviour the true Guid, and greatest Lover of Souls, or any of his Apostles after him, should never have given any Explanation of them?

I have already shewed, in answer to the Author, that the words of our Lord, *This is my Body*, could not, according to the Rules of Human Discourse, be taken Figuratively, so as to Signifie this is a Sign of my Body, unless the Apostles had bin before-hand prepared to understand them as so: There are no words Recorded by any of the Evangelists to dispose them to believe the words in such a sense, nor any indeed, that relate to the matter, unless it be some sayings of our Lord in the Sixth Chapter of Saint Johns Gospel, that were delivered before the Institution of the Eucharist, which I shall now consider.

The 6. of St.
John's Gospel
interpreted as
relating to the
Blessed Sacra-
ment.

* From v. 9. to
v. 15.

v. 22.

v. 25.

Transubstantiation Defended.

consider, for the further Clearing of the Point, as also those words of Saint Luke, *This do in remembrance of me*, used by our Lord, at the time of the Institution; and prove that none of these expressions do at all favor our Adversaries Figurative Sense, but the clean contrary.

We Read in the Sixth Chapter of Saint John's Gospel, that our Saviour had prepared the minds of his Disciples before-hand, by two great Miracles, both which tended towards the strengthning of their Faith in the Sacred Eu-
charist; the *Former being a Figure of this Sacrament, since in it he multiplied *Five Loaves*, so as to make them feed *five thousand* persons, altho' *the fragments which remained filled twelve baskets*, and were more in quantity than the five Loaves were at the first; so that they needed not to doubt, but he could feed as many thousands as he pleas'd with his own precious Body, exhibited under the Species of Bread, in the blessed Sacrament, and yet his Body be still one and the same: The latter shewing them, that he could Convey his Body how and whither he pleased, which made them ask him, when they saw him on the other side the Sea, without taking Ship at the shore, *Rabbi, when cameſt thou hither?* Then he proceeds to instruct them in Three of the greatest Mysteries of Religion. 1. His *Incarnation*, or coming down from Heaven, and taking Human Flesh upon him; from *verse 27.* where he also gives them a hint of the *blessed Sacrament, that meat that perisheth not*, to *v. 51.* 2. The Real Presence of his Body, and Manducation thereof, in the Sacrament (which wonderful Presence there, the Fathers did ever compare to the *Incarnation* it self) from *v. 51*, to *v. 59.* 3. The *Ascension* is mentioned, to Prove the two former Mysteries. *v. 62.*

Our Saviour, having styled himself the *Bread of Life*, towards the beginning of the Discourse of the *Incarnation*, *v. 33*, and *35.* after some Explication made of this, Repeats it again twice, *v. 49*, and *51.* to inculcate it the better into his Disciples minds: And then instructs them how they should be partakers of *this Bread*; not by believing only

only, that the Son of God came down from Heaven, and was made Man, taking upon him Human Flesh, but by feeding upon his Flesh in the Sacrament, which being a deep Mystery, that they might not doubt of the truth of it, he explains to them what he meant, when he said. v. 51. *I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven, if any man eat of me, he shall live for ever*; not by telling them, that by this Bread is meant the Doctrin, which he taught, or that by, *eating this Bread*, is to be understood, the believing of this Doctrin, in a Metaphorical or Parabolical Sense, as the *Socinians*, and *Sacramentarians* fondly imagin; or in like manner as he Explained the Parable of the *Sower that Sowed good Seed*, telling them that *the Field is the World, the good Seed are the Children of the Kingdom*; or as when he had said, *I have meat to eat which ye know not of*, he explained himself by saying, *my Meat is to do the Will of him that sent me*, putting the Predicate in the place of the Subject in the manner before hinted, and saying, *the Bread is my Word or the Doctrin that I teach*; but quite otherwise, he assures them, that *the Bread, that he will give them, is his Flesh, which he promiseth to give for the life of the world*, and which, by an Elegant Metaphor, Christ calleth *Bread*, because it was to afford nourishment to the Soul and Body both, in a Spiritual manner in the Sacrament, as the ordinary Bread, was to nourish the Body, in a carnal manner, by way of corporeal digestion, out of the Sacrament: And there is no doubt but the Jews understood our Lord in a proper Sense, when they said, v. 52. *How can this Man give us his flesh to eat?* Our Saviour did not answer this doubt, by telling them, (as he easily might have done in the Sacramentarian way) that no more was meant but believing stedfastly in his Death, and applying to themselves the merits of it, and which Explication he would have certainly given them, then, or afterwards, by Himself or by his Disciples, if no more had bin meant than so; as he did in the case of Parables, less difficult to understand, than this would have bin, if it had bin by our Lord proposed as one; but proceeds, to deliver this profound Mystery

Matth. 13. 24.

John 4. 32, 34.

John 6. 51.

vers. 53, 4, 5, 6, Mystery to them, in more express words, using a vehement Asseveration to confirm the truth of it: *Verily, verily*

I say unto you, except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of man, and

drink his Blood, ye have no life in you: Who so eateth my

Flesh, and drinketh my Blood, hath eternal Life, and I will raise

him up at the last day: For my Flesh is truly meat, my

Blood is truly drink: He that eateth my Flesh, and drinketh my

Blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him: As the living Father

bath sent me, and I live by the Father: So he that eateth me,

even he shall live by me: This is that Bread which came down

from Heaven; not as your Fathers did eat Manna, and are

Dead: He that eateth of this Bread shall live for ever: All

which words, being used by our Lord, to clear the doubt,

*and answer that Question of the Jews, *How can this man**

give us his Flesh to eat? I cannot imagin, how the Real Pre-

sence of Christs Body, and its Manducation in the Sacra-

ment, could have bin more fully Asserted, in order to the

disposing of his Disciples to believe the Sense of the Reali-

ty, when he should Institute his blessed Sacrament: And

*so the * Fathers interpret this place: And do not say, that*

the Manna, mentioned in the 58 verse, which was mira-

culously sent from Heaven, was a Type of ordinary Bread,

made by the Hands of Men, and set upon the Table, which

is of a far more Ignoble Nature and less Significant, than

the Manna which thus came down from Heaven; but of

the Real Body of Christ in the Sacrament, which was the

true Bread from Heaven, that nourished to Immortality:

After our Saviour had spoke thus to them, many of the

Disciples themselves, to whom Christ did not think fit as

yet to reveal the manner of feeding upon his Body in the

Blessed Sacrament, thinking that he meant, that his Body

was to be eaten in a grofs manner, like the Capernaites, cried

*out, *this is a hard saying, who can hear it?* To whom, as well*

as to the Jews, who before are said to murmur at him;

*because he said, *I am the Bread which came down from Heaven;**

*and that ask, *how this Man could give them his Flesh to eat?* our*

*Lord replies, *doth this offend you, and then clears the Doctrins**

to them, as far as he judg'd convenient for the confirmation

of

v. 41.

v. 52.

* aN. & d. s.

* See the Autho-
rities, *infra.*

of such high Mysteries, about which they were to exercise a strong and a lively Faith, by saying thus, v. 62. *What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?* As if he should have said, if you do not yet believe, that the Son of Man came down from Heaven, yet when you see him ascend thither again, you will be more ready to believe, that it was really God who came down, took Flesh and dwelt amongst you ; which Solution had relation chiefly to the former of the Mysteries, *viz.* his Incarnation ; but withal insinuates, that such as believe not his words touching the holy Sacrament, and think it impossible for him, to give his Body to be eaten in so many places at once, being yet on Earth, would be much more Scandalized and Tempted after they saw or knew him to have Ascended into Heaven.

Therefore, to clear the latter Mystery, and Solve their doubt, who thought, like the *Capernaites*, that Christ was to have *cut pieces of flesh from his body, and to have given them to be eaten* ; or that thought his Body to be that of a mere Man, he tells them, v. 63. *It is the Spirit that quickneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing*, that is, *the Flesh*, which he had told them before that they must eat, altho' not in the gross manner, without the *Spirit profiteth nothing* ; not but that by the *Spirit quickning it*, it profits very much ; Suitable to that of St. Paul. 1 Cor. 8.1. *Knowledge puffeth up, but Charity edifieth*, that is, *Knowledge without Charity puffeth up*, altho' when *Charity* is joyned with it to enliven it, it *edifieth*, and *Charity* it self *edifieth by Knowledge* : For if these words of Christ were to be taken in the Sense of the *Sacramentarians*, they would derogate no less from his Incarnation, Manhood and Death, than from the *Real Presence* of his Body in the Sacrament, in all which, without doubt, *the flesh profiteth* very much : Wherefore, our Lord goes on to tell them here, that, the words, *which he spake unto them, were Spirit and Life*, therefore not to be understood in the gross carnal Sense, before mentioned, which some of his Disciples took them in : For it is the use of the Scripture, to call Mans natural Sense, carnal Reasoning,

Transubstantiation Defended.

and resisting, or not reaching to the belief of Supernatural Truths, *Flesh and Blood*, as, *Math. 16. 17. Flesh and blood revealed not this to thee, &c.* but, *the words, that I speak unto you, they are Spirit and Life*; therefore, not to be carnally understood: But as by the Word of God, the World was Created, and Nature hath been, since, often chang'd; so, there is no doubt but Christ could, by it, change the Bread into his Body, as he did daily, by ordinary Natural Nutrition; but, * here in a supernatural way. Our Lord, therefore, said unto them, that their *Fathers did Eat Manna, in the Wilderness*, which was but a Type of this Heavenly Manna in the Sacrament, and yet they did *Spiritually feed upon Christ the Messias*; for it is said, *1 Cor. 10. 3, 4. That, they did all eat the same Spiritual Meat, and did all Drink the same Spiritual Drink; for they Drank of that Spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ, and yet they are Dead*, all of them a Temporal, some of them an Eternal Death also; and those of them which now live the Life Eternal, received this Life from the Son of God, who hath now given us the Antitype of that Manna which the Children of Israel did eat, *viz.* his own Body in the Sacrament, something of a far more excellent nature to feed upon, which will be to our Bodies, as well as to our Souls the Seed of Immortality, the Instrument, and Pledge of our Resurrection, Ascension, and Glorification. Yet as our Lord said to his Disciples, *there are some of you which believe not*, so we may say still of the Sacramentarians, who, notwithstanding all that Christ hath said, will admit of nothing but Signs, and Figures of imaginary virtue (whom nevertheless our Saviour hath no further instructed in any such easie Sense, as this, which might certainly have prevented their relapse as well as that of the Jews, his Disciples, and which if any such Sense had been to be admitted, would most certainly have been given) that they will not believe our Lord, and therefore they go away and will walk no more with him in the Communion of his Church.

Having, thus, made it to appear, that these words of Christ's

* *V. d. Gregorium
Nyssen infra.*

Christ's Institution, *This is my Body*, according to the Rules of human discourse, ought to be taken in a *proper* Sense, not only if considered in themselves, but especially if we regard what Christ hath said before touching the Sacrament, to dispose his Apostles thus to believe them; it will necessarily follow, that those words also of the Institution, *This do in remembrance of me* (which relate chiefly to the Priests Power and Duty, as the other did to the Body of Christ in the Sacrament, and which St. Paul explains in these words, *As often as ye eat this Bread and drink this Cup ye shew the Lord's Death till he come,*) ought not to be considered as a determination of the former words of the Institution in a Figurative Sense after the Sacramentalian way, but as a Declaration of one great end of the Sacrament, *viz.* The calling to mind, and setting forth of Christ's Death till he comes, which is so far from being a Reason to prove, that Christ's Body is not *Really* there, that on the contrary, this Commemoration and Annunciation is founded upon the Real Presence of Christ's Sacrificed Body and Blood in this Sacrament; since without this, it could not be done so effectually in Christ's Church as now it is. For, as the Jews, in eating the Peace-Offerings, did remember that they were slain for them; so by Offering here the Real Body of Christ, after the manner of an unbloody Sacrifice, we commemorate, and set forth, in this lively Exemplar, that Bloody Sacrifice, which Christ himself offered in a different manner upon the Cross, and receive the benefit thereof; which we need not to question, since he gives us daily of this Victim to feed upon in the Blessed Sacrament, tho' without the horror of Blood. Shall Christians, then, under a pretence of Celebrating the Memory of the Passion in the Eucharist, evacuate Christ's Institution, by taking away, from this pious Commemoration, that which, he out of his tender love, hath given us as most efficacious in it, for the good of our Bodies (into which this Sacrifice of Christ's Body being received, Sanctifies them, and Consecrates and prepares them for a Glorious Resurrection)

The words, *This do in remembrance of me*, explained.

Transubstantiation Defended.

on) as wells as for the good of our Souls ? Ought we not to consider , that Jesus Christ doth , not only Command us to remember him , but likewise that we should do this by feeding upon his Sacramented Body and Blood, since he doth not say , that Bread and Wine should be a Memorial of his Body and Blood, but that in doing what he prescribes us to do, which is, that in Receiving his Body and Blood , we should remember him ? And what more precious and lively Memorial could he give to his Disciples , and to all his beloved Children , what better Legacy could he bequeath them , at his departure out of the World, than this ? If the the Primitive Christians were inflamed with Zeal and Devotion when they approached to the Monuments , where the Bodies only of Holy Martyrs, lay Intombed ; more especially, if they could but touch any of their precious Reliquis, being by this means stirred up to a Pious Memorial, and imitation of their Holy Lives and Deaths ; and therefore, did Religiously preserve the smallest pieces, and even the Nails of that Cross , upon which Christ suffered, Commemorating thereby his Holy Passion ; how much more then should our Memory, and Love be excited , when we approach to the Holy Altar , and know , that we Receive there, tho' veiled under the Sacred Symbols, the very Body and Blood of our Lord, who Sacrificed himself for us, enlivened and quickened by his Grace and Spirit ?

The Real virtue
of Christ's Body
in the Sacrament,
cannot be proved
from Scripture
unless the Real
Presence of the
Body be admitted.

I could now proceed to shew, for the further confirmation of what I have here alledged, from the Authority of Holy Scripture, that unless the words of St. Johns Gospel above mentioned, as also the words of our Saviours Institution, be taken in the Sense of the Reality or Transubstantiation, that there is no promise to be found, in Holy Writ, of any Spiritual virtue to accompany this Sacrament ; so that , our Adversaries , whilst they are so eager to oppose the Reality, do, as much as in them lies, destroy the nature , and end of this Blessed Institution, and have no argument at all to use against the Socinian , who denies the Real Virtue, as well as the Real Presence

of

of Christ's Body, in the Sacrament: Which is the reason, why, I do sometimes term this Virtue, (which the Author, without ground conceives to be in this Ordinance, tho' separate from Christ's Real Body) Imaginary; because there is no reason to conclude the virtue of the Body to be here, from Scripture, unless the Body be so too; not that I would derogate at all from the virtue of Christ's Body, which by reason of the Hypostatical union is Infinite. But this task is already performed by a Learned Modern * Author: And the Reader may easily discern the Truth of what I have here asserted, by inspecting such places of Holy Scripture as relate to this Sacrament, into the number of which they will not allow the sixth Chapter of St. John's Gospel to be admitted.

M. Arnaud de
la perpetuite de
la foy. &c.
Tom. 2.

Having therefore thus explained those places of Holy Scripture which relate to the Blessed Sacrament, as also those other Forms of speaking, both of Divine and Human Authority, which the Author is pleas'd to compare with the Words of our Lord's Institution, and shew'd, upon comparing them together, that they will not at all fit his purpose, but prove the quite contrary to what he would have them to do: I shall now sum up such of the Reasons and Arguments for the understanding the Words, in which our Saviour Instituted this Blessed Sacrament, in a proper Sense (as the Catholic Church expounds them) as are plainly deduced from the Nature and End of this Holy Institution, and the Manner of expressing it in Holy Scripture (which I intreat the Christian Reader seriously to consider of) and so conclude this Head of Discourse.

1. Because Christ the great Lover of Souls never spake to his Apostles and Disciples in Figures and Parables which had any obscurity or difficult Sense, (especially, if the Discourse related to the Practice of a necessary Duty) with an intention to keep them in Ignorance; but * that their humble and well disposed minds might be the more excited and inflamed with a desire of inquiring into and understanding the true meaning of what he said, and that they might

Reasons from
Scripture for the
proper sense of
the words of In-
stitution.

* See Dr. Ham-
mond in Matt.
13. 13.

Transubstantiation Defended.

might the better retain it: And because in all such cases, even of less difficulty than this of the Sacrament (as particularly in the Parable of the Sower of Seed, altho' the Mystery, concerning the success of the Gospel which was herein prefigured, was not necessary for every one to know, as that of the Eucharist was) Christ did fully explain himself to his Disciples, who were also to instruct others. Therefore since the words of the Institution of the Blessed Sacrament, if understood Figuratively, as the Protestants, and particularly the Author, would have them to be, must need be allow'd to be obscure and difficult, because they differ so much among themselves, as well as from the Catholic Church, about the meaning of them, and yet none of the Evangelists nor St. *Paul*, altho' varying in expressing the Words of Institution, have inserted any words which in the least explain the Sense to be Figurative or Parabolical; hence it follows, That the Church hath great reason to understand them properly.

2. Because now, just upon our Lords Passion, it was the Time for Figures and Shadows to vanish, and for Truth and Reality to appear; And our Lord was Instituting the Great Sacrament of Christian Religion, he could not therefore speak with too much force and efficacy, especially, since he now spake to his Apostles in private, to whom he was used, at such times, to speak very plainly.

3. Because Christ was making his Last Will and Testament, which was to be expressed in such plain and distinct Terms, that there might be no just reason for his Children to contend about their Legacy: And can we be so unworthy as to imagin, that in this his Last and Kindest Bequest, he left us no more but a Morsel of Common dry Bread to eat, and a little ordinary Wine and Water to drink, in remembrance of him; whereas a kind and good natur'd Man will leave his most precious Jewel to his dear Friend to remember him by, when he departs from him to take a long Journey and to make any considerable stay? A good Father when he is to dye, thinks all his best Goods and Possessions

essions too little to leave his Children. He was also delivering a Commandment to observe, which that it might be rightly executed, ought to be promulg'd in a manner very intelligible.

4. Our Lord was near his Death, and therefore it was a time to avoid Obscurity in Speech, since he was not to continue any longer amongst them to interpret it.

5. Our Saviour in the choice of these words had not only regard to the Apostles, but he likewise spake them to all the Church in all succeeding Ages, and knew certainly, when he pronounced them, how they would always construe them; and yet, for the confirmation of the Sense of the Reality, did never suffer it to be call'd in question so much as privately, for almost a Thousand Years, when also the whole Body of his Pastors who were endu'd with extraordinary Light and Assistance of his Holy Spirit, to enable them to interpret aright the Divine Mysteri-
 es, had already just before in (a) Three Councils agreed upon this Sense, as that which had been constantly receiv'd in the Church ever since our Saviours Time, and which was more explicitly (b) declared against that one (c) Dis-
 fenter who sometime after appear'd against it, but was ashamed of his Opinion and recanted.

Lastly, if we consider, as hath been now fully prov'd, Conclusion of this Head of Discourse.
 That all the places of Holy Scripture, as also all other Forms of Human Discourse which are alledged by our Adversaries, as like to this of our Lords Institution, are wholly different from it, shewing them the quite contrary to what they pretend them for, and that our Saviour did neither before, at, or after the Institution any ways prepare or dispose his Disciples to understand these words in a Fi-
 gurative Sence, it must needs be very evident to any Man that will impartially regard things, that because Christ ever spake reasonably, and in a manner conformable to good Sense, and his Power infinitely exceeds the capacity of our Minds; therefore there is no Reason to understand those words of our Saviours, *THIS IS MY BODY*, and *THIS IS MY BLOOD* in a Metaphorical Sense,

K

as

(a) *Piz. The C. N. Justin p. 11. 2. the second Gener-
 al one at Nice,
 and that of
 Frankford.*

(b) *In the Coun-
 cil of Rome
 under Gregory 7.
 &c.*

(c) *Beren. ar. us.*

Transubstantiation Defended.

* See the Introduction

as the Author and the Sacramentarians do, *but an evident necessity* to believe them in that proper Sense, which * necessarily inferreth Transubstantiation, as the Catholic Church doth, since Scripture interpreted by the Rules of Human Discourse, as also the Tradition and Authority of this Church oblige us so to do: The latter of which is to be the Subject of the Second Part of the Answer to the Discourse against Transubstantiation.

The

The Contents of the First Part of the Answer to the Discourse against Transubstantiation.

1. *IT is shew'd that our Adversary doth not rightly state the Point.* . Page 1
2. *What is meant by Transubstantiation.* 4
3. *The Argument from Sense shew'd to be Senseless.* ibid.
4. *The Catholic Faith is ridicul'd by the Adversary.* 7
5. *The Real Presence and Transubstantiation depends on Gods Veracity.* 9
6. *No-Transubstantiation an Article of Faith with our Adversaries, and establish'd with Penalties.* 10
7. *The Method of the ensuing Discourse.* 11
8. *The Necessity of understanding our Lords words in the Sense of the Real Presence or Transubstantiation.* 13
9. *The Sense of the Schoolmen corrupted, and their Problematical Discourse mistaken for their Conclusion by the Adversary.* 16
10. *The Disparity between the Figurative Expressions in Holy Scripture, and the words of Institution, This is my Body, shews that the Latter are to be taken properly.* 25, &c.
11. *Principles upon which the ensuing Discourse is grounded.* ibid.
12. *How Catholics interpret the words of Institution, and how Protestants.* 26
13. *In what Sense Catholics allow a Figure in the Sacrament.* 28
14. *Rules to judg of Metaphorical Expressions by.* 31, 2.
15. *The Application of the forgoing Rules : by which it appears, that those merely Metaphorical Expressions of our Saviors being a Door, a V^{er}te, &c, are not at all like to the Form of Consecration, This is my Body.* 33, &c.
16. *A*

The CONTENTS.

16. *A Metaphor conveys no Spiritual Virtue.* Page 35
17. *The Exposition of Pharaoh's Dream doth not resemble the Sacred words of Consecration, This is my Body.* ibid.
18. *Distinctions and Rules for the following Discourse of the Nature of Signs.* ibid.
19. *Application of the foregoing Rules and Distinctions.* 37
20. *The Analogy which the words of Institution, This is my Body, might have to the Paschal Form in Scripture, or to those Phrases cited from Esdras, or any of the Rabins, doth not prove that Christ's words here, are taken Figuratively and not in a proper Sense.* 40
21. *A Deeds being call'd a Conveyance doth not prove that the words, This is my Body, are not to be taken properly.* 46
22. *Texts of Scripture examined, and prov'd not at all to favour the Sense of the Author of the Discourse against Transubstantiation.* 47
23. *Christ's Body being broken, and his Blood being poured out, for the Remission of Sins, before he was Crucified, proves the Sense of the Reality, or Transubstantiation.* 52.
24. *The 6th Chapter of S. John's Gospel interpreted as relating to the Blessed Sacrament.* 54, &c.
25. *The words, Do this in Remembrance of me, explain'd.* 59.
26. *The Real Virtue of Christ's Body in the Sacrament cannot be prov'd from Scripture, unless the Real Presence of his Body it self be admitted.* 60
27. *Further Reasons from Scripture for the proper Sense of the words of Institution, which necessarily inferreth Transubstantiation.* 61
28. *The Conclusion of this Head of Discourse upon Scripture Authority for the Real Presence and Transubstantiation; and of the first Part of the Answer to the Discourse against Transubstantiation.* 63

F I N I S.

